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# Shells

### Dems Good 1NC

#### Democrats will win.

Len **Lazarick** (Member and Editor for the MarylandReporter ) <http://marylandreporter.com/2014/06/25/democratic-establishment-largely-prevails-from-top-to-bottom-as-few-state-house-incumbents-lose/> June 25th, 2014

“Democratic establishment largely prevails from top to bottom, as few State House incumbents lose”

It was a good night for Democratic incumbents in the legislature and the Democratic establishment throughout the state as favored candidates from top to bottom did well in Tuesday’s primary. There were only nine incumbents who lost, while newcomers backed by incumbents won.¶ The Republican establishment did not fare quite as well. It was a bad night for two senior Republicans in the state Senate. Minority Leader David Brinkley lost to Del. Michael Hough, who portrayed Brinkley as too liberal for Frederick County, and Sen. Richard Colburn lost to Del. Addie Eckardt, a former ally and ticket mate on the Middle Shore. Colburn was rebounding from a messy and well publicized divorce resulting from an affair with a former aide.¶ Only two incumbent senators lost¶ The Senate chamber¶ Of 16 incumbent senators challenged within their own party, they were the only two that lost.¶ With other delegates and senators retiring or running for higher office, there will now be at least 47 new members among the 141 in the House of Delegates, and at least 10 new senators.¶ At the top of the Republican ticket, real estate executive Larry Hogan, a former Ehrlich administration patronage chief, beat Harford County Executive David Craig, favored by many in the Republican establishment.¶ In the nasty Republican race for Anne Arundel County Executive, appointed incumbent Laura Neuman lost to Del. Steve Schuh. The delegate made strong appeals as the “real” Republican with the backing of a long list of establishment party members including former Gov. Bob Ehrlich. He also raised over $1 million for the race.¶ But in Montgomery County, incumbent Democratic County Executive Ike Leggett, a former chair of the state party, easily won reelection with 46% against former County Executive Doug Duncanand County Council member Phil Andrews

#### Republican win ensures Iran sanctions and tanks the deal

Hunt 2014 [Albert R. Hunt is a Bloomberg View columnist. April 1, 2014 Delaware News Journal “Republican Senate could bypass Obama’s vetoes” http://www.delawareonline.com/story/opinion/contributors/2014/04/01/republican-senate-bypass-obamas-vetoes/7165339/]

• Foreign policy: The biggest issue might be a nuclear deal with Iran. Odds are the current negotiations will be extended until the end of this year or next year. For now, only the strong hand of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid prevents legislation that might scuttle the negotiations from coming to the floor.¶ If a deal is reached, a Republican Congress would probably refuse to repeal the sanctions imposed on Iran. The president can waive some of these measures by executive order. But Congress would still have latitude to complicate any arrangement.

#### New sanctions destroy negotiations- causes Iran prolif and war

Kahl 12-31 [Colin Kahl is an associate professor in the Security Studies Program in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, where he teaches courses on international relations, international security, the geopolitics of the Middle East, American foreign policy, and civil and ethnic conflict. He is also a senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), a Washington, DC-based think tank. 12-31-2013 “The Danger of New Iran Sanctions” National Interest http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-danger-new-iran-sanctions-9651?page=1]

The legislation defies a request by the Obama administration and ten Senate committee chairs to stand down on sanctions while negotiations continue. It also flies in the face of an unclassified intelligence assessment that new sanctions “would undermine the prospects for a successful comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran.” Proponents of the bill note that the proposed sanctions would only come into force if Iran violates the Geneva agreement or fails to move toward a final deal, and would not kick in for months. But the White House warns that enshrining new economic threats in law now runs counter to the spirit of the Geneva pledge of no new sanctions during negotiations, and risks empowering Iranian forces hoping to scuttle nuclear talks. The legislation also defines congressionally acceptable parameters for a final deal that Iran experts almost universally believe are unachievable, namely the requirement that Iran completely dismantle its uranium enrichment program. For these reasons, the administration believes the bill represents a poison pill that could kill diplomacy, making a nuclear-armed Iran or war more likely. Sanctions hawks disagree, arguing that the legislation will enable, not thwart, diplomatic progress. “Current sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table,” Senator Robert Menendez, the bill’s leading champion, contends, “and a credible threat of future sanctions will require Iran to cooperate and act in good faith at the negotiating table.”¶ But this logic badly misreads the historical effect of sanctions on Iranian behavior and under-appreciates the role played by Iran’s fractious domestic politics. A careful look at Iranian actions over the past decade suggests that economic pressure has sometimes been effective, but only when it aligns with particular Iranian political dynamics and policy preferences. And once domestic Iranian politics are factored in, the lesson for today’s sanctions debate is clear: the threat of additional sanctions, at this critical juncture, could derail negotiations toward a peaceful solution.

#### Iran prolif causes wildfire regional prolif- makes nuclear escalation inevitable

Dr. Shmuel Bar is Director of Studies at the Institute of Policy and Strategy in Herzliya, Israel. He served for thirty years in the Israeli intelligence community and since 2002 has headed research projects – many of them for U.S. government agencies – on issues such as Iranian defense doctrine, negotiating behavior and susceptibility to signaling, command and control culture in the Middle East, potential paradigms of command and control over nuclear weapons in Middle Eastern regimes, deterrence of terrorism, the influence of religion on deterrence, and implications of a polynuclear Middle East, among others Strategic Perspectives Number 7 2011 “Can Cold War Deterrence Apply to a Nuclear Iran?” http://www.jcpa.org/text/cold\_war\_deterrence\_nuclear\_iran.pdf

We should ask whether a polynuclear Middle East could be avoided in the wake of Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons. The answer to this question seems to be clearly negative. Failure to prevent Iran from nearing the nuclear threshold will undoubtedly intensify the drive of other states in the region for nuclear weapons. How will a polynuclear Middle East function? It is nearly certain that it will not look like the latter years of the Cold War. The religious and political drivers that will determine nuclear decision-making in the countries of the region will preclude integration of many of the checks and balances which evolved between the superpowers in the Cold War era. The most powerful driver that has the potential to impel the region to nuclear war is religion. Both Sunni and Shiite traditions of Jihad view the willingness to challenge superior force as an exemplary deed. In Shiite Islam, this is augmented by the idealization of suffering and martyrdom. Given weak command and control structures in the region, nuclear weapons may filter down to quasi-states (such as Kurdistan or the Palestinian Authority), terrorist organizations, and rival ethnic groups for whom the acquisition of nuclear weapons by a hostile state would be an incentive to acquire at least a limited WMD capability. The countries of the region will probably be more predisposed than the Cold War protagonists to brandish their nuclear weapons not only rhetorically but through nuclear alerts or nuclear tests, leading to situations of multilateral nuclear escalation. However, such multilateral escalation will not be mitigated by Cold War-type hotlines and means of signaling, and the absence of a credible second strike capability may well strengthen the tendency to opt for a first strike.

### Republicans Good 1NC

#### Republicans will take back the Senate

Caldwell 6-3 [Leigh Ann Caldwell, CNN Wire June 3, 2014 “2014 midterms: What's at stake” lexis]

Republicans have their best chance of winning back the majority since they lost it in the 2006 elections.¶ Democrats hold a 55-45 seat majority (53 Democrats and two independents who caucus with them) and could lose control of the chamber if they drop six seats.¶ That matters because Republicans would then likely control the House and the Senate. Government would be truly divided with President Barack Obama, a Democrat, still in the White House. Republicans would likely pass more legislation through Congress and the President would be forced to either allow GOP priorities to go through or stop them in their tracks with a veto. ¶ Democrats face a difficult task of maintaining their Senate majority. Of the 36 Senate races this year (a third of the Senate is up for election every two years), Democrats hold 21 seats. In other words, they are forced to play major defense. ¶ The Cook Political Report says Democrats have an extremely slim chance of keeping their seats in South Dakota and West Virginia, where the current Democratic senator in both is retiring and the states' electorates are likely too conservative to elect a new Democrat.¶ So the Democrats' defensive playbook comes down to seven races in red or purple states that they could lose: Louisiana, Arkansas, North Carolina, Alaska, Michigan, Montana and Iowa.¶ In addition, Republicans are hopeful they have a chance to knock off Democratic incumbents in Colorado and New Hampshire. In other words, they have multiple paths to retaking the Senate. ¶ "Democratic control of the Senate is at considerable risk, with the party at no better than even money to retain control in November," wrote Stuart Rothenberg, editor and publisher of the nonpartisan Rothenberg Political Report, one of the top political handicappers.

#### Republican win key to Asia Pivot

Keck 2014 [Zachary Keck is Associate Editor of The Diplomat where he authors The Pacific Realist blog. He also writes a monthly column for The National Interest.¶ Previously, he worked as Deputy Editor of e-International Relations and has interned at the Center for a New American Security and in the U.S. Congress, where he worked on defense issues April 22, 2014 The Diplomat “The Midterm Elections and the Asia Pivot” http://thediplomat.com/2014/04/the-midterm-elections-and-the-asia-pivot/]

There is a growing sense in the United States that when voters go to the polls this November, the Republican Party will win enough Senate seats to control both houses of Congress. This would potentially introduce more gridlock into an already dysfunctional American political system.¶ But it needn’t be all doom and gloom for U.S. foreign policy, including in the Asia-Pacific. In fact, the Republicans wrestling control of the Senate from the Democrats this November could be a boon for the U.S. Asia pivot. This is true for at least three reasons.¶ First, with little prospect of getting any of his domestic agenda through Congress, President Barack Obama will naturally focus his attention on foreign affairs. Presidents in general have a tendency to focus more attention on foreign policy during their second term, and this effect is magnified if the other party controls the legislature. And for good reason: U.S. presidents have far more latitude to take unilateral action in the realm of foreign affairs than in domestic policy. Additionally, the 2016 presidential election will consume much of the country’s media’s attention on domestic matters. It’s only when acting on the world stage that the president will still be able to stand taller in the media’s eyes than the candidates running to for legislative office.¶ Second, should the Democrats get pummeled in the midterm elections this year, President Obama is likely to make some personnel changes in the White House and cabinet. For instance, after the Republican Party incurred losses in the 2006 midterms, then-President George W. Bush quickly moved to replace Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld with the less partisan (at least in that era) Robert Gates. Obama followed suit by making key personnel changes after the Democrats “shellacking” in the 2010 midterm elections.¶ Should the Democrats face a similar fate in the 2014 midterm elections, Obama is also likely to make notable personnel changes. Other aides, particular former Clinton aides, are likely to leave the administration early in order to start vying for spots on Hillary Clinton’s presumed presidential campaign. Many of these changes are likely to be with domestic advisors given that domestic issues are certain to decide this year’s elections. Even so, many nominally domestic positions—such as Treasury and Commerce Secretary—have important implications for U.S. policy in Asia. Moreover, some of the post-election changes are likely be foreign policy and defense positions, which bodes well for Asia given the appalling lack of Asia expertise among Obama’s current senior advisors.¶ But the most important way a Republican victory in November will help the Asia Pivot is that the GOP in Congress are actually more favorable to the pivot than are members of Obama’s own party. For example, Congressional opposition to granting President Trade Promotional Authority — which is key to getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership ratified — is largely from Democratic legislators. Similarly, it is the Democrats who are largely in favor of the defense budget cuts that threaten to undermine America’s military posture in Asia.¶ If Republicans do prevail in November, President Obama will naturally want to find ways to bridge the very wide partisan gap between them. Asia offers the perfect issue area to begin reaching across the aisle.¶ The Republicans would have every incentive to reciprocate the President’s outreach. After all, by giving them control of the entire Legislative Branch, American voters will be expecting some results from the GOP before they would be ostensibly be ready to elect them to the White House in 2016. A Republican failure to achieve anything between 2014 and 2016 would risk putting the GOP in the same dilemma they faced in the 1996 and 2012 presidential elections. Working with the president to pass the TPP and strengthen America’s military’s posture in Asia would be ideal ways for the GOP to deliver results without violating their principles.

#### Solves Asia wars

Barno and Bensahel 2012 (David Barno, Lieutenant General, Center for a New American Security Senior Advisor and Senior Fellow, Nora Bensahel, Ph.D., CNAS Deputy Director of Studies and Senior Fellow, 1/6/12, You Can't Have It All, www.cnas.org/node/7641)

The pivot to the Asia-Pacific is essential because the region stands poised to become the centerpiece of the 21st-century global economy. By 2015, East Asian countries are expected to surpass North America and the eurozone to become the world's largest trading bloc. Market opportunities will only increase as the region swells by an additional 175 million people by 2030. As America's economic interests in the Asia-Pacific grow, its diplomatic and military presence should grow to defend against potential threats to those interests.¶ From the perspective of the United States and its Asian allies, China and North Korea represent the most serious military threats to regional security. China's military modernization continues to progress, and its foreign policy toward its neighbors has become increasingly aggressive over the past two years. Meanwhile, the death of Kim Jong Il means that nuclear-armed North Korea has begun a leadership transition that could lead to greater military aggressiveness as his son Kim Jong Un seeks to consolidate his power and demonstrate control. In light of these potential dangers, several Asian nations have asked the United States to strengthen its diplomatic and military presence in the region so it can remain the ultimate guarantor of peace and security. A bolstered U.S. presence will reassure allies who worry about American decline by clearly conveying an unwavering commitment to Asian security.

#### Asia conflict likely and goes nuclear war

Landy 2000 (Jonathan Landy, National Security expert at Knight Ridder, March 10, 2000, Lexis)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster.” In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia \_ with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources \_ indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.

# Uniqueness

## Dems Win

### Dems Win

#### Congress’s low approval ratings pose a major hurdle for Republicans

Harry **Enten,** senior political analyst, **June 18, 2014**, “Congress’s Low Approval Rating Is Hurting Republicans” http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/congresss-low-approval-rating-is-hurting-republicans/

President Obama’s approval rating is [stuck in the low 40s](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/obama-job-approval). That’s as low — if not lower — than it was four years ago, when Democrats sustained massive midterm losses. Republicans have a good chance to take the Senate and are very likely to keep control of the House, but they’re not running away with the 2014 midterm elections. Democrats remain even among likely voters on [the generic congressional ballot,](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2014-national-house-race) a [key measure](http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/democrats-generic-ballot-republicans-2010-2014/) of the national political environment. How is that possible? Well, Republicans control the House of Representatives, and Congress is super unpopular. On Monday, Gallup reported that [Congress’s approval rating](http://www.gallup.com/poll/171671/key-midterm-election-indicators-near-historical-lows.aspx) is just 16 percent. That [matches other polling data](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/congress-job-approval), and if that level of support holds through November, it would be the lowest heading into any midterm on record. What we’re left with is two unpopular entities — Obama and Congress — somewhat offsetting each other, leading to a national environment (as measured by the generic congressional ballot) in which neither party has that great of an edge.

#### Democrats chances understated

Danny **Vinik**, staff writer, April 21, 20**14**, “Republicans’ Chances of Taking the SenateAre Falling” <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/117466/2014-midterm-odds-republicans-chances-taking-senate-are-falling>

The Washington consensus right now is that Republicans are slight favorites to take control of the Senate in the midterms. FiveThirtyEight's Nate Silver put the odds at 60 percent. Other prognosticators agree. That may be true right now, but there are signs that the calculus could change in the coming months. Democrats may be in better shape than anyone realizes.

#### Democrat victory not such a long shot after all

Danny **Vinik**, staff writer, April 21, 20**14**, “Republicans’ Chances of Taking the SenateAre Falling” <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/117466/2014-midterm-odds-republicans-chances-taking-senate-are-falling>

Thus, regardless of the public’s support, or lack thereof, of the Affordable Care Act, Democrats face an uphill battle this year. But could they pull a miracle upset and actually increase their majority? RealClearPolitics' Sean Trende, the best conservative prognosticator out there, laid out that unlikely scenario in a piece last week: “The way this could occur is fairly straightforward: The Affordable Care Act improves; there’s no massive rate shock for premiums in September or October; and the economy slowly gains ground. This should propel President Obama’s job approval upward, lifting the collective Democratic boat.” That doesn’t sound like such a long shot. The media narrative about Obamacare seems to have turned a corner since the administration announced eight million signups. Every day, it seems, there is a new survey or report bearing good news about the law. This hasn’t improved the opinion polls yet, but it likely will. After all, support for the law didn’t deteriorate right after the catastrophic launch. It took more than a month to register.

#### The disputed districts come out democrat.

[Mike Jakaitis](http://www.wtop.com/?nid=635&sid=598732) (WTOP News Morning Drive Editor Local journalist)[Judy Taub](http://www.wtop.com/?nid=635&sid=598740) (WTOP News Midday Editor Local journalist and reporter)[Brian Drew](http://www.wtop.com/?nid=635&sid=2247727) (WTOP News Night Editor Local journalist) <http://liveblog.wtop.com/Event/Maryland_voters_head_to_the_polls_for_primary_elections?Page=2>

June 26 2014

Democratic voters overwhelmingly chose Lt. Gov. Anthony Brown to be their nominee for governor on the November ballot. ¶ Brown beat out Attorney General Doug Gansler, state Del. Heather Mizeur and three other candidates in the Democratic primary, winning 51 percent of the votes with 100 percent of precincts reporting. ¶ Gansler had 24 percent and Mizeur won 22 percent of votes cast as results continued to come in.¶ Absentee and provisional ballots have not yet been counted.¶ Larry Hogan won the GOP nomination with 43 percent of the votes, beating David Craig, Ron George and Charles Lollar.¶ Montgomery County, which reported poll book problems earlier in the day, was slow to report votes cast Tuesday at the polls, but with 100 percent of the county's precincts reporting, County Executive Ike Leggett won renomination with 45 percent of the vote.¶ The state's eight members of Congress all won their contests and will be on the November ballot seeking another two-year term.¶ General Assembly seats were also up for election.¶ Voters kicked Del. Don Dwyer out of office. His Anne Arundel County district gave more votes to five other candidates than the Pasadena Republican, who has served in the House since 2003. ¶ Former Prince George's Del. Tiffany Alston is also losing her bid to take back her seat.¶ Montgomery County Council results with 51 percent of precincts reporting District 1 Democrat Roger Berliner: 29 percent Duchy Trachtenberg 21 percent District 2 Democrat Neda Bolourian: 23 percent Craig L. Rice: 76 percent District 3 Democrat Guled Kassim: 3 percent Sidney A. Katz: 44 percent Tom Moore: 31 percent Ryan Spiegel: 22 percent District 5 Democrat Christopher Barclay: 8 percent Evan Glass: 35 percent Tom Hucker: 41 percent Terrill North: 10 percent Jeffrey Thames: 5 percent

#### Democrats will win the Senate and have a good chance at the House.

By: Jason **Easley** (Mr. Easley is a Senior White House and Congressional correspondent for PoliticusUSA. Jason spent four years as a political columnist and the politics editor)¶“Boehner’s Obama Lawsuit Backfires As Democrats Have Their Biggest Fundraising Day of 2014” http://www.politicususa.com/2014/06/26/boehners-obama-lawsuit-backfires-democrats-biggest-fundraising-day-2014.html Thursday, June, 26th, 2014, 5:25 pm

John Boehner’s lawsuit against President Obama is already showing signs of becoming a Republican disaster, as thanks to Boehner, House Democrats had their biggest fundraising day of 2014.¶ According to [Politico](http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/john-boehner-lawsuit-dccc-fundraising-108360.html#ixzz35mW2mlzC), “Speaker John Boehner’s announcement that House Republicans would sue President Barack Obama for misusing executive authority turned into a big payday for congressional Democrats. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee posted its best fundraising day of the year on Wednesday, bringing in $584,000, according to figures shared with POLITICO.”¶ It is obvious that part of the motivation for bringing up [this lawsuit now](http://www.politicususa.com/2014/06/24/john-boehner-house-republicans-suing-obama-president.html) was to fire up the Republican base ahead of the 2014 election. Since Republicans can’t run against Obamacare, and their latest Benghazi revival has flopped miserably, congressional Republicans needed something to run on. Boehner and his allies assumed that nothing would get the Republican base riled up more than dangling a whiff of Obama impeachment in front of them.¶ What Speaker Boehner didn’t count on was that his antics would also fire up Democratic voters. Yesterday’s record DCCC fundraising was $100,000 more than the previous record that was set in February after Paul Ryan revealed his budget. The majority of the 27,000 online donations came from people who donated less than $200. **A sign of just how badly Republicans misjudged the lawsuit’s impact of Democrats was that 7,885 of the DCCC’s received donations came from first time donors.** ¶ The lawsuit was already looking like it would [politically backfire on Republicans,](http://www.politicususa.com/2014/06/26/white-house-rips-john-boehners-taxpayer-funded-lawsuit-president-obama.html) and now it is financially backfiring on them too. Democrats who may have been planning on sitting 2014 out are getting engaged. Potential Democratic voters need to understand that 2014 isn’t going to be a typical midterm election. Republicans are eyeing up the Senate, and [potentially removing President Obama from office](http://www.politicususa.com/2014/06/25/john-boehners-lawsuit-step-republican-plot-impeach-president-obama.html).¶ If Speaker Boehner thought that he was going to be able to threaten President Obama with legal action with no consequences from Democrats, he was mistaken. Democrats aren’t about to sit back and let Republicans steal the presidency. Instead of motivating Republican voters, John Boehner may have awoken the same Democratic sleeping giant that crushed the GOP in 2006, 2008, and 2012.

#### Democrats have found the easier Republican to beat gives the democrats the senate majority.

Sean Trende, (is the senior elections analyst for RealClearPolitics and a senior columnist for the Crystal Ball. He is the author of The Lost Majority: Why the Future of Government Is Up for Grabs and Who Will Take It, and co-author of the Almanac of American Politics 2014.) “Picking Your Primary Poison”¶ June 19th, 2014 http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/picking-your-primary-poison/

Analysts are noticing the Democrats’ efforts to meddle in Republican primaries. In a Wall Street Journal article from last month, [Janet Hook](http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2014/05/15/democrats-dip-into-gop-primaries-try-to-pick-their-opponent/?mod=WSJ_hppMIDDLENexttoWhatsNewsSecond) writes “Democrats increasingly are running ads against GOP candidates even before they win their party’s nomination. By attacking GOP candidates while they are still embroiled in a primary election campaign, some Democrats have seen an opportunity to promote the GOP candidate they think is easiest to beat, or to weaken the one they consider strongest.”¶ Hook points to attempts by Democrats to swing the Republican nomination in North Carolina to candidates other than Thom Tillis, whom many viewed as the most electable Republican. Although Democrats failed to produce a potentially weaker Republican nominee in the Tar Heel State (Tillis won the GOP nomination), they have been more successful in other races.¶ Perhaps most famously, Democrats devoted resources toward enhancing Rep. Todd Akin’s chances of winning the Republican nomination in the 2012 Republican Senate primary in Missouri. Shortly after winning the nomination, Akin made his infamous comments suggesting that a woman who was “legitimate[ly]” raped could not become impregnated, mostly guaranteeing that Sen. Claire McCaskill (D) would win reelection. In 2010, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) likewise helped to ensure that his opponent in the fall would be state Sen. Sharron Angle (R), rather than the (presumably) more formidable Sue Lowden (R).¶ In truth, this is not a new technique. We could draw on many examples across time, but I thought that this would be a good time to tell a particular story, which is the earliest example of a politician attempting to interfere in an opposing party’s nomination contest of which I’m aware.¶ This seems particularly important as the Thad Cochran-Chris McDaniel Republican Senate runoff in Mississippi approaches; many Democrats are cheering on McDaniel, but perhaps they should be careful what they wish for.¶ Perhaps the most important lesson from this is merely one of historical significance. We tend to see history and elections as constituting an unbending, inevitable arc toward what we now label modernity. In truth, there is nothing inevitable about it, and behind every monumental accomplishment lie thousands of contingencies that could have been decided either way. The greatest president of the 20th Century was very nearly not the Democratic nominee. That fact alone counsels a great degree of humility when scouring the historical record in an attempt to make predictions about the future.

#### Republicans are not likely to win midterms; lack of moderates is the driving force

Neil Vigdor. June 11, 2014. Connecticut Post. "Weicker: GOP doomed in midterm elections" http://www.ctpost.com/news/article/Weicker-GOP-doomed-in-midterm-elections-5545523.php

This is probably not the "independent" political analysis Republicans in Connecticut want to hear. GOP exile-turned-renegade Lowell Weicker Jr. on Wednesday gave his former party slim chances of reversing its fortunes in this year's midterm elections in the state he governed from 1991 to 1995. Speaking to about 150 members of the Retired Men's Association in his former hometown of Greenwich, where Weicker was first selectman, the former governor, U.S. senator and congressman said Connecticut is likely to be stuck with one-party rule by the Democrats. "Now, that's not the fault of Democrats," Weicker, 83, said. "It's the fault of the Republican Party, both in the state of Connecticut and nationally. I would hope that this party would broaden its base." Fewer in numbers than unaffiliated voters and Democrats, Republicans in Connecticut haven't fielded a winning candidate for statewide office or Congress since 2006. "I can't believe that Republicans aren't fed up with losing, losing and losing," Weicker said. "Unless the Republican Party presents a centrist group (of candidates) and a centrist platform, they're going nowhere in this state." State Republican Chairman Jerry Labriola Jr. said while he values the opinion of Weicker, with whom he speaks from time to time, the outlook for the GOP is favorable. "With all due respect to my friend Lowell Weicker, this election will be a referendum on the economy and our future," Labriola said. "Our candidates are determined to lead Connecticut to economic growth and recovery, which is not even in the vocabulary of (Democratic Gov.) Dan Malloy. This is the best way to broaden the base of our party, through results, not demagoguery." Weicker's bleak forecast for the GOP came the morning after the stunning upset of Republican House Majority Leader Eric Cantor in a primary race for Virginia's 7th Congressional District. He was beaten by Dave Brat, a tea party-aligned college professor who was heavily outspent. "I think the Republican Party is going to have a real problem nationally with the tea party gnawing away at it," Weicker said. Estranged from the GOP for more than two decades, Weicker ran for governor and won under the independent banner of A Connecticut Party in 1990. "Like Al Smith, he could run on a laundry ticket and get elected," said Lloyd Hull, who introduced Weicker to the retiree group and was referring to the late New York governor. Hull's daughter is married to Weicker's son. A former three-term senator who was a member of a special committee that investigated the Watergate break-in, Weicker is widely known for establishing the state income tax when he was governor. "Even to this day, I have people who don't take kindly to me for instituting the income tax," said Weicker, who resides in Old Lyme. Weicker defended the measure during the question-and-answer portion of the program at First Presbyterian Church, saying that he inherited a $1 billion budget deficit and lowered the state sales and corporate taxes as governor. "I don't know where we got the idea that in the state of Connecticut, we can have it all without paying for it," Weicker said. A supporter of Barack Obama in the past two elections, Weicker said the president deserves credit for championing the Affordable Care Act, but has disappointed on Middle East policy and his relations with Congress. He attributed the latter to the 2009 death of Sen. Ted Kennedy, D-Mass., a key Obama ally and University of Virginia Law schoolmate of Weicker. "I think the absence of Ted Kennedy beside Obama -- to help steer him through the House and Senate -- that's been pretty devastating," Weicker said. Harkening to his days as a liberal Republican, Weicker slammed the country's response to gun violence. "To sit by and see our kids killed, I think, is just nuts," he said. "All assault weapons ought to be banned. All handguns should be banned. I am tired of looking at the pictures of the dead children."

Republicans to lose seats, not gain

Spandan Chakrabarti. June 24, 2014. The People's View "What the Polls are Really Saying: GOP Tanking Faster than They Can Drag Down Obama and Dems." http://www.thepeoplesview.net/main/2014/6/24/polls-have-no-good-news-for-republicans

It has long been conventional wisdom that in midterm elections, the sitting president's party loses seats in Congress. Further, national media's talking heads, egged on by Nate Silver (who bombed the Eric Cantor primary just as badly as any other pollster of record), are taking their cues from the slaughter of a midterm for the Democrats in 2010. The problem is, however, as the pollsters and pundits pontificate and nod knowingly, they are almost universally overlooking the key fact in this year's polling - even if the polling is to be trusted (see Cantor, Eric. Majority Leader, Ex). While the pontificators are busy touting how badly President Obama is polling, what they won't say is that Republicans are categorically polling not only far worse than the President, but much worse than Democrats in general. Take last week's Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, for example. All the headlines said that President Obama's numbers are tied with his all-time lows in that poll. What they didn't mention is that Republican numbers are falling off the cliff. If you look at the relative favorability/approval data the WSJ/NBC poll reveals, the true picture looks more like this: The President's net favorability is upside down by 4 points (41-45), and the Democrats as a party are down 2 points (38-40). Note that both the President's and the Democratic Party's ratings are within the poll's margin of error. But the Republican Party has a net disapproval rating of a whopping 26 points (29% of Americans feel positively about the GOP, compared with 55% disgusted by them). Just 6% of Americans have "very positive" feelings about the Party of No, and just 8% say the same about their driving force, the Tea Party. The Tea Party. The modern GOP's life force as well as Frankenstein. It's bad enough that their net favorability is upside down by 19 points (22-41, and by following them the GOP has managed to make themselves even more unpopular than their Frankenstein), but the electoral implication is really more pronounced when their numbers are compared to the same poll at the same point in the election cycle four years ago. At that time, the Tea Party had a net positive favorability rating of 3 points (34-31). That is a 22-point flip, and it means that GOP's core is despised far more now than they were in 2010. It's worth noting that compared to the same 2010 poll, the standing of the Democratic party has actually slightly improved, while the GOP's has severely deteriorated. "GOP Tanking Faster than they can drag down Obama and Dems" should have been the headline story about this poll, and every other one like it. After all, that is what the data shows. But the media focused on the doom and gloom for the President. Why? Because any other storyline would expose the little houses of cards they are building. 2014 is not 2010. The American people have had four years to think over that mistake, and they have had six years to watch the Party of No, fueled by the racists and bigots in the Tea Party do everything they can to thwart anything good for the middle class. The American people are scantly aware of the process in Washington, and as such are not happy that nothing is getting done legislatively. For that, they blame everyone - allowing the Democrats' and the President's ratings to be dragged down. But we are not nearly as ready to hand the keys back to the crazies. While the GOP and the Tea Party have done a good job of pulling down the president with them in the polls, not only is he notches above them, they have actually been shooting themselves in the foot a lot more. The poll, or others like it, are not, in any shape or form, indicating a bloodbath for Democrats or a second Republican wave in November, the media's drama queen nature notwithstanding. 2014 is not 2010.

#### Democrats have better party organization and are able to yield more voter turnout, even if polls show Republicans are going to win, of those people polled more Democrats will turnout for the Midterms

Jason Easley April 22nd, 2014 "Democratic Odds of Keeping The Senate Are Improving Every Single Day "http://www.politicususa.com/2014/04/22/democratic-odds-keeping-senate-improving-single-day.html

The latest New York Times projection show Republican odds of capturing the Senate are declining, and that the Democrats may keep control of the US Senate. The NY Times’ latest projection found that things are looking better for Democrats: Every day, our computer churns through the latest polls and reams of historical data to calculate both parties’ chances of winning control of the Senate. Although the Democrats currently have a 51 percent chance, that doesn’t mean we’re predicting the Democrats to win the Senate — the probability is essentially the same as a coin flip. The Republicans’ chances have been declining in recent weeks, falling from a recent high of 54 percent. This is mostly due to some unfavorable polls in Arkansas and Iowa. It should be noted that the Times gives Republicans an over 70% chance of keeping their Senate seats in Georgia (73%) and Kentucky (79%). This projection isn’t matching up well with what appears to be happening in each state. In both Kentucky and Georgia, it looks like Democrats have at least a 50/50 chance of taking one or both of those seats. If one listens to the mainstream media, or talking heads on cable news, it is possible to come away with the impression that the Republican takeover of the Senate is a done deal, but this based more on opinion than reality. The only people who should be shocked if Democrats keep control of the Senate will be Republicans, who are again convincing themselves that they are sure to win, and the talking head pundits on television. Democrats are facing a tough landscape, but they also possess superior candidates and organization. The missing puzzle piece for Democrats in midterms has always been turnout. If they get even a reasonable turnout, Mitch McConnell’s dream of being majority leader will be crushed and denied.

#### Polls mean nothing when it comes to elections, but even if they do Republicans have lower approval ratings than Obama or Democrats

Curtis Gans. 2/25/2014. Huffington Post "Why 2014 Could Be a Very Democratic Election"http://www.huffingtonpost.com/curtis-gans/2014-elections-democrats\_b\_4832331.html

It may be that the greatest contribution in Nate Silver's young life is not the PECOTA system he developed for evaluating baseball players and projecting their future contributions, the accuracy of his 2012 election forecasts or his new ESPN-housed enterprise, but rather his book The Signal and the Noise. The book is an elegant, intellectually omnivorous, well-researched and disciplined assertion of the need for prediction and for prognostications to be as accurate and useful as possible. He looks at the egregious failures of prediction due to blind spots in imagination -- not considering the possibility of an air attack on Pearl Harbor because of a belief that, were Japan to attack, it would do so via sabotage by U.S. resident Japanese or not seeing the possibility of an Al Qaeda attack using hijacked airplanes to ram buildings. He also notes that in some fields, notably in predicting major earthquakes, forecasting has not made major advances because all scientific models have so far led nowhere. But his main thesis, grossly oversimplified, is that when predictions tend to be wrong, it is because those making them do not distinguish between the signal and the noise -- between information, data, and events that are necessary building blocks toward accurate prognostication and other data, information, events and commentary that may appear relevant to some but essentially lead one astray. This is a good framework for looking at the early predictions for the 2014 election. The current consensus in Washington is that 2014 will be a Republican election -- that they will gain some seats in the U.S. House, that they have a realistic chance of recapturing a bare majority in the U.S. Senate and that they will continue to enjoy a sizable edge among the nation's governors and hold their own in the state legislatures. This common wisdom is based on a series of premises, many of which are more noise than signal. Among them: A historical record of a two-term president's party losing legislative and executive seats in almost all previous mid-term elections following his re-election; polls showing a majority opposes the president's signature achievement, the Affordable Care Act (ACA); other polls showing Obama's favorability rating at low ebb; missteps in the roll out of the ACA and promises made that citizens would be able to retain their existing health care policies if they liked them that were inaccurate and could not be kept. The record will show that the Democratic Party sustained no net losses in the U.S. Senate and gained five seats in the House in the 1998 mid-term during President Clinton's second term and after Monica Lewinsky and impeachment dominated the news for the majority of the year. The record will also show that January polls tend to be irrelevant to November results or President Muskie would have been elected in 1972 and Hillary Clinton would have been the Democratic nominee and probable president in 2008. Foibles from a year earlier will only be remembered around election time if nothing has changed to render them obsolete. All of these are noise. What could be either signal or noise in the Republican election scenario are two factors: 1) The mid-term electorate is substantially smaller (by as much as 20 percentage points) than the presidential year electorate, and it tends to include fewer young voters and minorities; and 2) There are twice as many Democratic Senate seats up for election in this cycle as there are Republican and, according to the Cook Political Report, there are only 77 House districts that were won by a 55-45 margin or less in 2012, only 33 by 52-48 or less -- and those nearly evenly divided between Democratic and Republican winners. Elections are not decided by how many turn out, but rather who turns out, and it is not at all clear at this juncture whether the deep divisions within the Republican Party will reduce GOP turnout by a greater amount than the likely lower turnout of some key Democratic constituencies. At this juncture the Democrats are defending several more U.S. Senate seats that are competitive than are the Republicans. They face challenges in Iowa, Montana and South Dakota to replace senators who have moved on, and in Alaska, Arkansas, Louisiana, and North Carolina where incumbent Democrats have only a precarious hold on their seats. It is conceivable that they could lose all of these seats and no seat that the Republicans now hold would swing to the Democrats -- such as in Georgia where the daughter of the revered Sam Nunn is challenging a GOP in disarray; or Kentucky where Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell is viewed unfavorably. It is not likely. Thanks to the "shellacking" of the Democrats as Obama called it in 2010, the Republicans not only gained six seats in the U.S. Senate, 68 seats in the House, more than 600 seats in state legislatures and a net of six governorships. Those results allowed the GOP to control the House, control both the legislatures and governorships in 29 states and made it virtually impossible for the Democrats to overcome filibusters in the Senate. Perhaps of greater long-term import, the control that the Republicans had in the 29 states allowed them to favorably gerrymander House and state legislative districts, a redistricting which will be in place until the 2020 Census. All of which makes it unlikely that the Democrats can garner the 17 net seats to regain control of the House or substantially reduce the degree of control the GOP has in the state legislature -- unless the 2014 election becomes a pro-Democratic wave election. Despite current conventional wisdom, such an election is not only possible but probable but only if three signals occur: If September polls, the polls taken when people are paying attention to the upcoming election, show a substantial improvement in Obama's approval rating and an equally substantial increase in public support of the Affordable Care Act, and if the economy does not relapse into recession. There are many signals pointing to Republican vulnerability, including: The 2013 Elections: Chris Christie was the only statewide office-holder win for the Republicans, and the defeat of the larger of two tax-increase proposals in Colorado was the only victory for Republican ideas. But Christie's victory brought zero legislative gains and Colorado passed a more modest tax increase measure on the same ballot. In Virginia, Democrats hold every statewide office and now, as a result of this election, control the state Senate. The Congresses of the Past Three Years: For most of the past year, Congressional performance approval ratings have wallowed in the high single digits to the low teens, the lowest for any institution and the lowest ever for Congress. For the past three years, Congress has been the least productive of any in recent memory and perhaps in its history. The public, by modest majorities, puts the blame for the low approval and lack of production squarely on the Republican-controlled House of Representatives and their intransigent right-wing.

#### Cantor loss provides momentum for Democrats to hold seats- shows the Republicans are trending too far right

McKenzie 6-11 [Drew McKenzie 6-11-2014 “Pelosi on Midterm Elections: It's a Whole New Ball Game” <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/Nancy-Pelosi-Cantor-midterm-elections/2014/06/11/id/576346/>]

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi is thrilled that her Republican counterpart Eric Cantor lost to little-known tea party candidate Dave Brat because it’s turned the midterm elections into "a whole new ball game."¶ "Eric Cantor has long been the face of House Republicans’ extreme policies, debilitating dysfunction, and manufactured crises," the California Democrat said in a statement, according to Talking Points Memo.¶ "Tonight is a major victory for the tea party as they yet again pull the Republican Party further to the radical right. As far as the midterm elections are concerned, it’s a whole new ballgame."¶ Democrats face long odds of winning back the House in the 2014 elections. Pelosi and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Steve Israel say that Cantor’s defeat has at least opened the door for Democrats to win several competitive seats in November fueled by the fear of having a right-wing government in power, according to Politico.

#### Cantor loss dries up Republican money

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

But the most direct and lasting effects of the Cantor loss, Democrats say, are likely to be on the mechanics behind the campaigns.¶ Much of the money backing Republican candidates this year is going to come from outside groups. Cantor was his conference’s biggest fundraiser on Wall Street and among the pro-Israel community — and Democrats believe that money will dry up, both because Cantor’s gone, and because those donors will now be more wary of believing that House Republicans aren’t beholden to the tea party.

#### Democrats will hold on by painting Republicans as extremists

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

But they do think the conversation Cantor’s loss sparked in the coverage has helped feed a larger sense of Republican extremism and obstructionism.¶ “Dave Brat is not a brand. The Republican lurch to the right is a brand,” said Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Steve Israel (D-N.Y.). “The Brat win is Exhibit A in our argument, but there are lots of exhibits to our argument. It accelerates the GOP’s move to the right.”¶ “Cantor lost because he wasn’t extreme enough, and that’s the direction of the Republican Party,” said Stephanie Cutter, Obama’s deputy campaign manager in 2012. “These larger narratives of the party getting pulled to the right is something the Republicans need to be worried about.”

#### Focus is moving to Republican obstructionism

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

Until about 7:40 p.m. on Tuesday, the conventional wisdom had been that the Republican establishment had gotten the tea party under control, and the focus was on Obama’s problems. The election had been cast as a referendum on the president. Now, Democrats say they think they’ve got fodder to make the argument that November will be a referendum on Washington: The president is still a big part of that — but Cantor’s loss should be a reminder that Republicans are, too.

### Dems Win- Internal Polls

#### Internal polls confirm Democrats can hold on to the Senate if they can run against Republican dysfunction

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

Already, people familiar with internal Democratic polling say it shows that whenever Obama rails against “Congress,” people tend to hear “Republicans.”¶ “The narrative has changed,” said Democratic National Committee communications director Mo Elleithee. “To the extent that this election is a referendum on who has broken Washington and left the middle class twisting in the wind, the spotlight is focused squarely on House Republicans.”¶ “From the Democratic perspective, it goes to the heart of the contrast between Democrats and Republicans” on economic issues and which party will fight for the middle class, said Obama pollster Joel Benenson. “That is something Democrats in tough districts and swing districts should be able to run on and capitalize on.”

### Dems Win- Republican Obstruction

#### Republican obstructionism will sink them- empirically true

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

Benenson pointed to the 2012 presidential election, which he described as a contrast of visions and values — and which the Democrat won.¶ “The fundamental weakness in the Republican brand is their obstructionism, that they’re hellbent on blocking everything. There is a lot of frustration with Washington and Washington politics,” he said. “That is why Republicans have the most tarnished brand.”

### Their Polls Lie

#### Republican polls lie about how far ahead they are

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

And for the insider game, Democratic operatives think the people paying the most attention to the campaigns will remember what turned out to be a 44 percent margin of error in the Cantor-Brat polling. And even if they don’t remember, operatives will make sure to remind them of it every time there’s a new GOP poll that shows their candidate ahead, arguing that Republicans either don’t have the data or are lying about what it is.¶ “The Republican apparatus, which is designed to give people the impression that they are ahead, took a big hit,” said DSCC deputy executive director Matt Canter. “It matters to the chattering class. It matters to the media. It matters to donors. And it matters to press back home, which means it matters to voters.”

### Dems Win- Republicans Implode

#### Cantor loss proves the Republicans will just implode on their own

Dovere and Brown 6-12 [Edward-Issac Dovere and Carrie Budoff Brown 6-12-2014 Politico “Giddy Dems’ new strategy: Watch the GOP implode” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/06/giddy-dems-new-strategy-watch-the-gop-implode-107766.html#ixzz34enjzvrP]

Democratic operatives were just as surprised as everyone else by Eric Cantor’s defeat — but now they’re trying to figure out how to make the most of it.¶ Virginia’s 7th Congressional District probably isn’t going their way, regardless of the Republican candidate switch. But operatives planning for the midterms believe they can turn Tuesday’s surprising tea party resurgence into something much bigger.¶ They see the attention to the defeat as another cut at the House Republicans as extremists, a new way to highlight congressional dysfunction, a chance to pump more GOP distrust into the Latino voters Democrats are hoping to turn out in force in November, an argument that Republicans are in much worse shape than they’ve purported to be.

## Republicans Win

### Republicans Win

#### Republicans will take back the Senate

Caldwell 6-3 [Leigh Ann Caldwell, CNN Wire June 3, 2014 “2014 midterms: What's at stake” lexis]

Republicans have their best chance of winning back the majority since they lost it in the 2006 elections.¶ Democrats hold a 55-45 seat majority (53 Democrats and two independents who caucus with them) and could lose control of the chamber if they drop six seats.¶ That matters because Republicans would then likely control the House and the Senate. Government would be truly divided with President Barack Obama, a Democrat, still in the White House. Republicans would likely pass more legislation through Congress and the President would be forced to either allow GOP priorities to go through or stop them in their tracks with a veto. ¶ Democrats face a difficult task of maintaining their Senate majority. Of the 36 Senate races this year (a third of the Senate is up for election every two years), Democrats hold 21 seats. In other words, they are forced to play major defense. ¶ The Cook Political Report says Democrats have an extremely slim chance of keeping their seats in South Dakota and West Virginia, where the current Democratic senator in both is retiring and the states' electorates are likely too conservative to elect a new Democrat.¶ So the Democrats' defensive playbook comes down to seven races in red or purple states that they could lose: Louisiana, Arkansas, North Carolina, Alaska, Michigan, Montana and Iowa.¶ In addition, Republicans are hopeful they have a chance to knock off Democratic incumbents in Colorado and New Hampshire. In other words, they have multiple paths to retaking the Senate. ¶ "Democratic control of the Senate is at considerable risk, with the party at no better than even money to retain control in November," wrote Stuart Rothenberg, editor and publisher of the nonpartisan Rothenberg Political Report, one of the top political handicappers.

#### Republicans have lead in enthusiasum

Caldwell 6-3 [Leigh Ann Caldwell, CNN Wire June 3, 2014 “2014 midterms: What's at stake” lexis]

Democrats are working to do everything possible to motivate their base. A March CBS News poll found that while 70% of Republicans are excited to vote only 58% of Democrats are. The enthusiasm gap doesn't bode well for Democrats who are well aware that Democratic voters are less likely to vote in non-presidential election years. ¶ Even the head of the committee tasked with electing Democrats to the House admits it. Rep. Steve Israel says Democratic candidates have a tough time in midterms.¶ "Well, look, there's a tough climate, no question about it," he said on CNN's "State of the Union" in April.

#### Obama policies are unpopular in key states

Judis 6-12 [John B. Judis 6-12-2014 The New Republic “Democrats, Don't Dance on Cantor's Grave” http://www.newrepublic.com/article/118108/senate-2014-why-democrats-will-probably-lose]

Barring something entirely unforeseen, the Republicans will retain control of the House of Representatives in November, and in the wake of Eric Cantor’s ouster, will be even less inclined to compromise with the White House. The key battle will be for the Senate, and at this point—given the unpopularity of President Obama and his programs in the states that could decide the outcome—the Republicans are a good bet to regain the Senate. The recent scandal involving Bowe Bergdahl and the older scandal about Benghazi won’t decide the outcome, but they are certainly not going to help the Democrats. It’s not 1998, when Republican exploitation of a White House sex scandal actually cost them seats in the House. ¶ The Senate is currently divided between 55 Democrats (counting two independents who caucus with the Democrats) and 45 Republicans. Thirty-six senate seats are up for grabs this November. Of these, 21 are unlikely to change hands. Two Democratic seats in West Virginia and South Dakota are very likely to go Republican. Thirteen (assuming Chris McDaniel wins the runoff in Mississippi) could conceivably go either way, and of them, ten are held by Democrats. So if the Republicans were to hold their seats in Mississippi, Kentucky and Georgia, then they would have to win only four of the remaining ten seats in order to take back the Senate. That’s not a tall mountain to climb. ¶ If you look at the 13 races, they are almost all in states where Obama and his signature programs, including the Affordable Care Act, gun control, and the plan to restrict carbon emissions from power plants, are very unpopular. That goes without saying in Southern states where Democrats are running for re-election. In Louisiana, Obama’s approval rating is at 41 percent and support for the ACA at 33 percent. In Arkansas, Obama’s approval is at 34 percent and Obamacare’s is at 31 percent. In North Carolina, Obama’s approval is at 41 percent. Fifty-two percent of registered voters in Arkansas, 58 percent in Louisiana, and 53 percent in North Carolina would not vote for a candidate who does not share their view of Obamacare. It’s likely that most of these are opponents of the president’s program.¶ But Obama and his programs don’t fare much better in Eastern, Midwestern, and Rocky Mountain states where Democrats are defending seats. In Iowa, Obama’s approval rating is at 42 percent and only 30.7 percent of Iowans think the country is on “the right track.” In Colorado, Obama’s approval is at 38 percent, Obamacare’s at 39 percent, and 73 percent think the shape of the national economy is either “not so good” or “poor.” In Michigan, 53 percent oppose Obamacare, and in New Hampshire 57.6 percent. ¶ Obama’s climate initiative may help Democrats in 2016 and is popular in some states that the president carried in 2012, but it will probably not be popular in some of the crucial swing states this November. As the National Republican Senate Committee has noted, Arkansas, Colorado, West Virginia, Michigan, Iowa, Kentucky and Montana—all except Kentucky with Democratic incumbents—depend on coal for more than half their energy needs. Obama’s other initiatives are also not popular in some swing states. In Colorado, 56 percent of voters now oppose the state’s strict gun control laws. In Michigan, a plurality opposed Obama’s gun control proposals.

#### Democrats don’t have any issues to run on

Judis 6-12 [John B. Judis 6-12-2014 The New Republic “Democrats, Don't Dance on Cantor's Grave” http://www.newrepublic.com/article/118108/senate-2014-why-democrats-will-probably-lose]

The Democrats have not developed a national theme—comparable, say, to the Reagan administration’s “staying the course” in the 1982 election—to rally voters to their cause. Many of the Democratic candidates are trumpeting the party’s support for boosting the minimum wage and for women’s rights—two issues that are popular with voters—but few of the embattled Democrats are running on the White House’s record. With Obama and his programs so unpopular in the key election states, the Democrats in these states are desperately trying to distance themselves from the national party. Congressman Travis Childers, who is likely to face Tea Party favorite McDaniel in Mississippi’s senate race, actually has a very small chance of winning only because he voted against the Affordable Care Act. In Kentucky, Democrat Allison Grimes promised to “fiercely oppose” the president’s climate change plan. While the Republicans are seeking to nationalize the campaign, Democrats like Grimes or Mary Landrieu in Louisiana or Mark Pryor in Arkansas want to make the election all about themselves and not about their party or the President.

### Republicans Win- A2: Dem Ground Game

#### They aren’t going to lose the ground game this time

Caldwell 6-3 [Leigh Ann Caldwell, CNN Wire June 3, 2014 “2014 midterms: What's at stake” lexis]

The Republican Party learned from Obama's impressive ground game during the 2008 and 2012 elections.¶ This will be the first opportunity for the GOP, led by the Republican National Committee, to use new data gathering techniques, technology and on-the-ground campaign volunteer recruitment to expand their base and persuade voters.¶ RNC Chair Reince Priebus praised those efforts during the Florida-13 special election.¶ The RNC says it has recruited 14,000 precinct captains in targeted congressional districts and Senate and gubernatorial races around the country.

### Republicans Win- Trends

#### Trends are all pointing for Republicans

Judis 6-12 [John B. Judis 6-12-2014 The New Republic “Democrats, Don't Dance on Cantor's Grave” http://www.newrepublic.com/article/118108/senate-2014-why-democrats-will-probably-lose]

Obama and the Democrats seem poised to suffer from the “six year itch” that the president’s party has usually suffered during midterm elections of a second term. Ronald Reagan’s Republicans lost the Senate in 1986, and George W. Bush’s Republicans lost it in 2006. The exception was Bill Clinton’s Democrats in 1998, who broke even in the Senate and won five House seats. That was because Clinton remained very popular, thanks to a booming economy. His job approval in the weeks before the election was in the low 60 percent range. The impeachment inquiry, which Republicans had hoped would discredit the president and the Democrats, actually helped the Democrats. Southern black voters, who enthusiastically backed Clinton and believed he was being unfairly targeted, turned out in large numbers. ¶ But the Democrats’ situation this year is very different. The economy is still in the doldrums, Obama is unpopular, and Republican scandal-mongering is unlikely to generate a backlash. In 1998, many Democrats took offense at the Republican impeachment efforts because they were aimed not merely at censuring Clinton, but at unseating him. To date, the Republicans have not used the Benghazi and Bergdahl scandals to call for Obama’s removal. Instead, they have merely called for investigations. And as recent polls have shown, many Democrats and Independents, as well as Republicans, favor an investigation into Benghazi and are critical of the administration’s deal with the Taliban for Bergdahl’s release. That probably means that the scandals will be a small, and probably temporary, net plus for the Republicans. They will cast a pall over the White House and, with an assist from Fox News, fire up the Republican base.

### A2: Republicans are Too Radical

#### Republicans are running their strongest candidates

Trygstad 6-10 [Kyle Trygstad 6-10-2014 Roll Call “Relieved Senate Republicans Look Forward to November” http://atr.rollcall.com/senate-2014-map-gop-primaries/?dcz=]

The Senate primaries of note are nearly done, and Republicans are close to their best-possible scenario of GOP nominees to make a run at the majority in 2014.¶ Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina was expected Tuesday to become the latest Republican success story of the midterm primaries. His nomination won’t have any bearing on the fight for Senate control, but it’s thematic — along with Ed Gillespie’s long-expected nomination at the Virginia GOP convention over the weekend — of the kind of year Republicans are having at the halfway point.¶ Outside of Sen. Thad Cochran’s runoff in Mississippi, Republicans continue to emerge from these nomination fights with the candidates they believe are best equipped to compete in an expanded Senate landscape. Now, with fall airtime reservations starting to pick up, the party can mostly look forward to what is still a challenging fight for Senate control in the fall.¶ “So far so good for Senate Republicans in 2014,” said GOP pollster Glen Bolger of Public Opinion Strategies. “It appears that Republican voters are tired of throwing away Senate seats by nominating unelectable candidates in swing states.“Of course,” he continued, “winning the primary does not automatically equate to winning the general, even in 2014. But, chances of winning in November are much greater when we are able to field a stronger team.”

### Republicans Win- Energy Policy

#### Republicans will win- Obama energy policy

Kraushaar 6-5 [Josh Kraushaar 6-5-2014 National Journal “Obama Is Sabotaging Democratic Senate Hopes” http://www.nationaljournal.com/against-the-grain/obama-is-sabotaging-democratic-senate-hopes-20140605]

The president reportedly has told his close allies that losing the Senate would be "unbearable," but his administration is doing everything possible to make things difficult for his party's most vulnerable senators. On energy issues alone, the administration's decisions to impose new Environmental Protection Agency regulations on coal-fired plants and indefinitely delay a decision on the Keystone XL pipeline could help burnish his long-term environmental legacy, but at the expense of losing complete control of Congress.

# Links

## Dems Good

### Generic--- Ocean Development Unpopular

#### Oceans focus recalls images of Obama as an ineffective president

Bump 12 (30 Aug, Philip, former writer for the Gristmill, now the Atlantic Wire, Gristmill: “Romney treats climate as a punchline” http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:Ikqf7qkOvo0J:grist.org/news/romney-uses-the-bully-pulpit-to-mock-climate-change/+&cd=9&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us)

President Obama promised to begin to slow the rise of the oceans and to heal the planet. MY promise … is to help you and your family. This was one of the key points Mitt Romney made in the speech he gave Thursday night to officially accept the presidential nomination of the Republican Party. This was the speech immediately before the balloon drop, his primary sales pitch to undecided voters who hadn’t yet made up their minds. The quote was one of a few key passages Romney released to the press beforehand — one of the points the campaign thought were most important to get into newspaper articles before papers went to print. The quote Romney references here is from a speech Obama gave on June 3, 2008, the night he wrapped up the nomination for the Democratic Party. In context, it reads like this. The journey will be difficult. The road will be long. I face this challenge with profound humility, and knowledge of my own limitations. But I also face it with limitless faith in the capacity of the American people. Because if we are willing to work for it, and fight for it, and believe in it, then I am absolutely certain that generations from now, we will be able to look back and tell our children that this was the moment when we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless; this was the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal; this was the moment when we ended a war and secured our nation and restored our image as the last, best hope on Earth. This was the moment — this was the time — when we came together to remake this great nation so that it may always reflect our very best selves, and our highest ideals. Obama’s point, of course, was that he’d been endorsed to fight for what the Democratic Party believes in: a strong safety net, employment, addressing climate change, ending the war in Iraq, burnishing an image of the United States that had been gutted by the man then holding the office. In the past four years, he clearly hasn’t accomplished all of that; on many points, he’s fallen much shorter than Democrats had hoped. But this was a statement of intent, an exhortation to ideals. As soon as he gave the speech, the section about the ocean became a symbol for an opposition intent to portray Obama as an effete other. The next day, the clip was posted on YouTube, with the title “Obama Promises The World.” When you search for that phrase on Google during the latter part of 2008, the first site that returns a result is “ObamaMessiah.blogspot.com.” Obama’s claim that we might address the rise of the oceans was seen as a man claiming dominion over the universe, not as a sensible priority for a president in the year 2008. That year, Mitt Romney was also running for president, though his campaign had ended by the time Obama gave that speech. During that campaign in 2008, Romney admitted that climate change was occurring, and that humans were contributing to it. But Romney lost. So now, Mitt Romney derides the scientific fact of climate change as he finds better political success in the Republican primary. And he has embraced the support of those who wrung from Obama’s hopeful, excited words such bizarre insinuations. What Romney argues is a classic false choice: the idea that we must either choose to save the environment or put people to work. It’s the sort of argument that lets polluters squat in poor communities, insisting that they be allowed to do as they wish or they’ll take their jobs elsewhere. It’s a choice that need not be made, as demonstrated by green jobs and the burgeoning industries built around renewables and efficiency and sustainability. But that’s not actually what Romney was arguing. He was arguing that Obama is a weirdo who cares more about dolphins than Americans. That Romney will be there for the kids after school with a Wonder bread sandwich while Obama is nursing a spotted owl back to health with his halo.

### Generic--- Ocean Policy Unpopular

#### Public opposes ocean development - view it as environmentally destructive

Bricklemyer et al 4 (Eugene, Shelby Smith, Cuauhtemoc Leon, Boris Graizbord and Richard Kyle Paisley, "PRESERVATION OF COASTAL SPACES A DIALOGUE ON OREGON'S EXPERIENCE WITH INTEGRATED LAND USE MANAGEMENT," 9 Ocean & Coastal L.J. 239, lexis)

The reality of this impression is borne out by recent reports of the impacts of continued development. The United States Department of Commerce's National Ocean Services (NOS) recently released a national eutrophication report detailing the effects of nutrient enrichment in over ninety percent of the estuarine surface of the United States and the Mississippi River Plume. n9 Of those waters surveyed, the NOS found that over sixty-five percent suffered from moderate to high degradation due to nutrient enrichment. n10 Most discouraging was the study's conclusion as to current trends. According to the study, continuing development combined  [\*242]  with the present level and types of controls will only lead to a worsening situation in the future. n11 Thus, it is not surprising that professional coastal conservationists are concerned. Given the experience of many years of study and the observation of development along the Charleston-area coast, Dana Beach, executive director of the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, has recently finished an assessment from the front lines for the Pew Oceans Commission. n12 A summary of Mr. Beach's observations and recommendations gathered from the vantage point of work with a heavily stressed coastal zone may be useful in setting the stage for our discussion. Mr. Beach's basic conclusion was that, while federal law and ensuing state CZMA programs may be helpful, they have not stopped the destruction because the CZMA programs do not focus on the core problem. While such programs can determine at the site level the appropriateness, for instance, of a berm or dock permit, they generally do not provide large-scale regional growth management, development control or zoning regulation. Human occupation density on the coast is already five times that of the interior of the United States, and all indications point toward a continuing increase, especially with the added pressures of affluent retiring baby boomers. Comprehensive planning for smart (or, in some places, no) growth is imperative. n13 n10. Id. at 9. n11. Id. at 43. No less arbiter of public opinionthan the New York Times has repeatedly stated editorially that the results of studies conducted by the Pew Oceans Commission and the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy confirm that, among a handful of the most serious problems threatening the health of oceans and the ecosystems they support, over-development of the coast is a major culprit. See Still at Sea, N.Y. Times, Jan. 8, 2005, at A14; Blueprints for Healthier Oceans, N.Y. Times, May 8, 2004, at A28. n12. See Dana Beach, South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, Coastal Sprawl: The Effects of Urban Design on Aquatic Ecosystems in the United States, available at <http://www.pewoceans.org/reports/water> pollution sprawl.pdf (last visited May 26, 2004). As an interesting historical aside, before and while the CZMA was being passed, there was a simultaneous but failed attempt to pass a Henry Jackson-sponsored and President Nixon-supported Land Use Policy Act and Planning Assistance Act, S.268, 93rd Congress, 1st Session (1973). This was an attempt to adopt a national focus to protect and plan for any development of land of critical environmental concern, including coastal and estuarine zones. Such land was to be managed by the Department of the Interior. The law was intended to be process-oriented and programmatic. See Baird B. Brown, The Recent Trend in Federal Land Use Regulation, 10 Willamette L.J. 464 (1974) [hereinafter Brown, The Recent Trend in Federal Land Use Regulation].

n13. Brown, The Recent Trend in Federal Land Use Regulation, supra note 12, at 13.

#### Public opposes ocean development – latent feelings about ocean protection

Spruill 97 (Vikki N., President and CEO of Ocean Conservancy since 2006, Executive Director, Sea Web (not profit strategic communications firm dedicated to ocean research) “U.S. PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES” Oceanography Vol. 10 No 3. <http://www.tos.org/oceanography/archive/10-3_spruill.pdf>)

Government Needs to Do More; Personal Action Preferred to Joining Organizations; Ocean Exploration Favored over Space In a country where polls indicate that the majority of the public wants the fed- eral government out of their lives, 85% said they believed the government needed to do more to help protect the ocean. Per- haps most surprisingly, an overwhelming number (72%) believed funding for ocean exploration was a more important priority than funding for space exploration (17%). Questioned on the kinds of actions people are prepared to take on behalf of the ocean, those polled indicated that Americans are most likely to engage in personal action and less likely to become involved in lobbying, participate in group activities, or join local or national envi- ronmental organizations. Roughly one- half (49%) said they would be almost cer- tain to recycle their used motor oil, and 42% said they would be almost certain to pick up litter at the beach. A much smaller number (20%) said they would be prepared to pay higher water bills to build better sewage treatment plants; 18% indi- cated that they would be very likely to contact politicians to urge they take posi- tive actions to help the ocean; 12% said they would join an environmental organi- zation; and only 10% said they would be almost certain to attend council or state legislative meetings on ocean issues. These personal actions are apparently not only the most appealing, they are also considered by those polled to be the most effective. Nearly three-quarters (70%) stated that recycling used motor oil would be a very effective action toward ocean protection; 63% said the same of picking up litter on the beach. In general, the poll suggests that Ameri- cans feel they have a responsibility to pro- tect the ocean. There was strong agreement (84%) with the statement "'we have a re- sponsibility to protect the ocean for future generations," and 82% strongly agreed that the "destruction of the ocean is a threat to the health of future generations."

#### Especially women voters

Lilley 10 (Summer, Jonathan Charles, PhD in Marine Biology, “NAVIGATING A SEA OF VALUES: UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD THE OCEAN AND OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES” <http://www.ceoe.udel.edu/windpower/resources/J_Lilley_8-03_FINAL.pdf>)

With regard to environmental beliefs and values, geographic location and sex prove influential. There exist a number of differences between people living in the coastal zone and those who live away from the coast, with the more pronounced differences among those who live within coastal zip codes. These people are more cognizant of the economic importance of the ocean and more likely to feel they have a responsibility to protect and preserve the ocean. People living in coastal zips also hold slightly less anthropocentric attitudes when it comes to humans’ relationship to the environment. Women are also less anthropocentric than men and more likely to understand they have a personal impact on the ocean. Additionally, women feel that anti-pollution laws should be enforced more strongly.

### LOST Unpopular

#### Conservative opposition to the treaty would be strong

Ballasy 2012 [Nicholas Ballasy senior video reporter 5-9-2012 Daily Caller “Panetta: US needs ‘bipartisan spirit and leadership that Dick Lugar embodies’” http://dailycaller.com/2012/05/09/panetta-us-needs-bipartisan-spirit-and-leadership-that-dick-lugar-embodies-video/]

Many conservatives oppose the Law of the Seas treaty, noting that president Ronald Reagan first refused to join its signers in 1982. Reagan said then that it was the product of unfriendly nations whose goal was to redistribute the world’s riches from the United States and other developed nations to the Third World.¶ It would also hand jurisdiction over most of the world’s ocean mass to a UN body, and subject the United States to mandatory dispute resolution, even with countries that have no diplomatic ties with the U.S.

### Offshore Wind Unpopular

#### Offshore wind projects are unpopular- splits environmental groups who would usually support wind power

Firestone and Kempton 2005 [Jeremy Firestone and Willett Kempton ¶ College of Marine Studies ¶ University of Delaware ¶ To be presented at ¶ Copenhagen Offshore Wind 2005 ¶ 26-28 October 2005 ¶ “Public Opinion about Large Offshore Wind Power: ¶ Underlying Factors” http://wind.nrel.gov/public/SeaCon/Proceedings/Copenhagen.Offshore.Wind.2005/documents/papers/Poster/Firestone\_Kempton\_PublicOpinionaboutlargeoffshorewin.pdf]

A proposal has been submitted to the US Federal Government, and to the Commonwealth ¶ of Massachusetts, by a private company, Cape Wind Associates.2¶ They propose to install ¶ 130 wind turbines in 62 Km2¶ (24 square miles) of Nantucket Sound. It plans to use ¶ General Electric’s 3.6s, designed exclusively for offshore use. Mounted, they would rise ¶ 128 meters from sea level to top blade tip (420 feet, or about 40 stories) and their ¶ nameplate electrical output is 3.6 MW. This development is projected to generate a peak ¶ power of 420 MW, adding up to 1,491,384 MW hours of electricity per year, which is ¶ about 3/4 the electrical needs of Cape Cod, or 1/10 of the demand of the entire state of ¶ Massachusetts (Cape Wind 2004a).3¶ The developer states that Nantucket Sound is a ¶ highly favorable site for wind development, arguably the best in the east coast (strong ¶ steady winds, close to power lines on shore, shallow water, protected from high waves, ¶ and minimal conflicts with transportation systems). ¶ ¶ But this proposal has generated a vigorous local opposition movement, focused around ¶ the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound (an organization specifically created to oppose ¶ the development). The Alliance seems to have both popular support and a financially ¶ strong core. In 2003 it received $1.7 million from 2,891 individuals, with just 56 of them ¶ giving $1.3 million of that; the top four individuals gave over $100,000 each, including a ¶ loan that was forgiven (Zindler 2004). A similar pattern with a small number of large and ¶ very large donations was seen in 2002 (Zindler 2003). Opposition is also politically well connected, with declared opponents including the Editorial page of the Cape Cod Times, US Sen. Ted Kennedy, U.S. Rep. William Delahunt, several state legislators, and the Massachusetts Governor and Attorney General. The opposition comes primarily from those who consider themselves environmentalists. For example, the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound’s web site says: “The Alliance is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit environmental organization dedicated to long-term preservation of Nantucket Sound” (Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound 2004). The various opponents mostly support wind power in general, and split on whether they oppose wind power anywhere in the ocean. Opposition from those who consider themselves environmentalists has been seen in other wind projects (Bosley and Bosley 1988; Walker 1995; Krohn and Damborg 1999; Wolsink 2000).

#### NIMBY groups still oppose despite offshore nature

Maiorino 2013 [Al Maiorino President, Public Strategy Group Energy Manager Today May 6, 2013 “Placing Wind Farms Offshore Doesn’t Deter Opposition” http://www.energymanagertoday.com/placing-wind-farms-offshore-doesnt-deter-opposition-091615/]

Offshore wind projects, though they are environmentally friendly and create electricity through wind, still face opposition from NIMBY (not in my backyard) groups. Many offshore wind projects have and still are facing opposition today.

#### Offshore wind is highly controversial- multiple reasons

Madsen 2010 [Nancy Madsen Times Staff Writer March 4, 2010 “Crowds oppose offshore wind” http://www.watertowndailytimes.com/article/20100304/NEWS03/303049965]

PULASKI — Opponents of a proposal for offshore wind power projects raised a rallying cry at a meeting Wednesday night at the H. Douglas Barclay Courthouse.¶ About 80 people from Oswego, Jefferson and Wayne counties attended the meeting organized by the Joint Commission for the Preservation of Lake Ontario Communities, a coalition blessed by the boards of legislators in Jefferson and Oswego counties.¶ The members of the public gave economics, wildlife and viewshed as reasons to oppose the New York Power Authority's inclusion of eastern Lake Ontario as a possible site for turbines.

#### Drilling unpopular – support is on the decline

Pew Research 13 (September 26, “Continued Support for Keystone XL Pipeline” http://www.people-press.org/2013/09/26/continued-support-for-keystone-xl-pipeline/#energy-boom)

The share of Americans citing energy issues as a top priority was unchanged from last year at 45%, down from a high of 60% in 2009, according to a survey conducted Jan. 15-19. Partisan differences about the importance of the issue were small. The recent energy boom in the U.S. has not registered widely with the public. Our September 2013 survey found that only 48% correctly say that U.S. energy production is up in recent years. But there is no indication that awareness of the nation’s growing energy production is related to energy policy attitudes. Two-thirds or more of Americans favor government policies to require better fuel efficiency more funding for alternative energy research and more spending on mass transit. A smaller majority supports more offshore oil and gas drilling. By nearly three-to-one (73% to 25%), the public supports requiring better vehicle fuel efficiency, according our September 2013 survey. An identical percentage (73%) favors federal funding for alternative energy research, while two-thirds (67%) back more spending on mass transit. A majority (58%) also favors more offshore oil and gas drilling. That is lower than last year, when 65% supported more offshore oil and gas drilling.

#### Drilling unpopular – deepwater horizon destroyed *dem support* for offshore drilling

Nelson 10 (July 22, Josh, political commenter at FireDogLake, “Rasmussen: Support For Offshore Drilling Reaches New Low” http://my.firedoglake.com/joshnelson/2010/07/22/rasmussen-support-for-offshore-drilling-reaches-new-low/)

New data shows that support for offshore drilling has reached its lowest level ever in Rasmussen’s latest polling. Here’s how the GOP-friendly pollster\*\* frames the latest data (emphasis mine): With the deepwater oil leak apparently capped after three months of gushing into the Gulf of Mexico, support for both offshore oil drilling and drilling further out in deepwater remains largely unchanged. Most voters also remain concerned about the potential environmental impact of new drilling. A new Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey finds that 56% of U.S. Voters now believe offshore oil drilling should be allowed, while 26% oppose it. One-in-five voters (19%) are undecided. That’s down from 60% last month. Since the oil rig explosion that caused the massive oil leak, support for offshore drilling has ranged from 56% to 64%. Predictably, Rasmussen leaves most of the useful information out of their analysis. In their polling immediately prior to the rig explosion in the Gulf, 72% of likely voters supported offshore drilling. Even with Rasmussen’s skewed likely voter model, this represents a 16% shift in just 11 weeks. The current level of support among likely voters, 56%, is the lowest ever recorded by Rasmussen for this question. Moreover, support among Democrats for offshore drilling has dropped from 54% in early April to just 29% in the latest poll. Support among Republicans remains relatively flat, down just 4%. GOP support for offshore drilling, at 82%, is actually up 8% from its low point in late May.

### OCS Unpopular--- Environmentalists

#### Environmental groups hate the plan – they’ll halt progress because of drilling

WorldWatch 14 (May 20, http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5874)

The U.S. Congress is likely to debate an energy package this month that would lift the offshore drilling ban. It could also offer financial support for renewable energy technologies and policies that reduce fossil fuel consumption. Politicians in both chambers of Congress who previously opposed offshore drilling are now expressing support for expanded energy policies. Even Santa Barbara County supports offshore drilling.

The political showdown has forced environmental groups to decide between staunchly opposing offshore drilling or supporting legislation that furthers their wider goals in addressing the climate crisis. While most environmentalists oppose offshore drilling, some leading environmental groups may ease their opposition in favor of clean energy policies that have so far floundered in Congress. If national organizations support offshore drilling, they risk further divisions with local environmental groups that are based along U.S. coastlines. "The leaders of local environmental groups are digging in their heels. They only want to talk about offshore drilling," said Eric Smith, a political science professor at the University of California in Santa Barbara. "Meanwhile, lots of environmentalists are saying we ought to talk more broadly and talk about what to do with climate change. We have a fight here. It reflects a fight on coastal zones around the country."

#### Environmental groups hate drilling – they’re crucial to dem success

The Washington Times 8 (July 16, S.A. Miller “Green groups bolster lobby against offshore drilling” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jul/16/green-groups-bolster-lobby-against-offshore-drilli/?page=all>)

Environmental groups are scrambling to shore up opposition in the Democrat-led Congress to more offshore oil drilling, countering the push for added domestic production by President Bush and voters pinched by rising gasoline prices. “There are plenty of us on the other side creating pressure, too,” said Friends of the Earth, which is unleashing a campaign targeting select congressional districts to fend off calls for Congress to let the offshore drilling ban expire Sept. 30. The 40-year-old advocacy group is increasing its lobbying on Capitol Hill and rallying activists nationwide with e-mail alerts, newsletters and phone calls warning against what they see as a “land grab by the oil industry” that will not lower gas prices, he said. Meg Boyle, a climate policy specialist for the group. The environmentalist movement forms a crucial piece of the Democrats’ base, and the two remain close allies, but the gas-price crisis tests the relationship.

### Aquaculture Unpopular

#### Environmental lobby drowns out support for aquaculture- people who should support it don’t

Seafood News 2007 [Seafood News July 16, 2007 “The big mistake environmentalists are making on aquaculture” http://seafood.typepad.com/the\_winding\_glass/2007/07/the-big-mistake.html]

Environmentalists have the power to kill this bill. The fact is the offshore aquaculture bill is enabling legislation -- it would create conditions for an industry to develop. IN this context, there is no huge pressure group lobbying for this to happen. In fact the opposite-- many fishermen don't care, and in some areas, such as Alaska, they are passionately opposed.¶ So, we have the powerful environmental lobby lined up against .........no one. NOAA has indicated much willingness to build in environmental safeguards in the permitting process. But there has to be a permitting process to begin with. Unless the regulations are practical, no one will ever invest in offshore aquaculture, as NFI's president Jeff Davis keeps saying.¶ So, here the environmentalists have the power to either kill off the bill completely, or make it worthless, by going for the long ball -- their maximum demands. Like the give swordfish a break campaign, the ones likely to be hurt by this are American consumers and the environmentally responsible aquaculture companies, like Kona Blue.¶ If environmental groups are opposed to everything but closed land based system aquaculture, they should say so, but not be taken seriously on this bill. For the rest, who see a long term future in Aquaculture, a responsible compromise today to get a workable bill will yield long term results tomorrow.¶

#### Strong oppostition to aquaculture

Boutilier 2012 [Alex Boutilier Metro Halifax June 4 2012 “Conservation groups unite in opposition to aquaculture strategy” http://metronews.ca/news/halifax/249894/conservation-groups-unite-in-opposition-to-aquaculture-strategy/]

Over 100 conservation groups and commercial fisheries organizations came together in Halifax on Monday to voice their concerns about Nova Scotia’s new aquaculture strategy.¶ About 250 people filled a conference room at the Lord Nelson hotel Monday to call on the government to impose a three year moratorium on open-net pen fish farming.¶ “Premier Darrell Dexter, we have a message for you today: You do not have permission to do this,” said Raymond Plourde with the Ecology Action Centre.¶ “We elect (a government) to provide good governance. Wise, considered decision making. We do not elect them to provide ham-fisted autocracy and decisions by royal proclamation that the serfs and vassals of the province must live with.”¶ Plourde and other presenters detailed a number of concerns about fish farming, including increased waste dumped into the ocean and the use of potentially harmful pesticides. The topic made headlines recently after a number of pen-raised salmon had to be destroyed due to an outbreak of infectious salmon anemia in the Shelburne area.¶ “We said, look, just like we said, all these problems and viruses! What does (Fisheries and Aquaculture Minister Sterling Belliveau) say? He says ‘to me, it’s just another normal day in aquaculture’,” said Plourde.

#### Significant opposition to marine aquaculture

Knapp 2012 [Gunnar Knapp Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, “The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture” Bull. Fish. Res. Agen. No. 35, 51-63, 2012 https://www.fra.affrc.go.jp/bulletin/bull/bull35/35-7.pdf]

Many Americans perceive potential negative ¶ effects of marine aquaculture without offsetting ¶ positive effects: A variety of groups of Americans ¶ perceive potential negative effects of marine ¶ aquaculture. These include:¶ •Commercial fishermen, who fear economic ¶ competition and environmental damage to wild ¶ fish stocks.¶ •Coastal residents, who fear loss of access to ¶ waterfront and changes in the views they enjoy.¶ •Environmentalists, who worry variously that ¶ marine aquaculture will cause pollution, harm ¶ marine ecosystems, or increase pressure on ¶ global wild fish stocks harvested for production ¶ of fishmeal and fish oil used in fish feeds.¶ 　These groups play significant roles in the politics ¶ of United States marine aquaculture, across the ¶ political and regulatory process at local, state, ¶ and national levels. For example, Alaska salmon ¶ fishermen spearheaded the Alaska legislature’s ¶ 1990 ban on finfish farming, and continue to vocally ¶ oppose aquaculture development in federal waters ¶ nationwide, along with Alaska’s congressional ¶ delegation (Figure 4).¶ 　Similarly, coastal residents have strongly and ¶ effectively opposed marine aquaculture in states ¶ such as Maine and Washington. Sebastian Belle, ¶ Executive Director of the Maine Aquaculture ¶ Association, described the political challenges facing ¶ aquaculture as a result of demographic shifts in ¶ coastal regions:¶ 　　“In Maine…part of the application process ¶ for the series of permits and licenses needed ¶ to operate in the marine environment is ¶ an exhaustive series of meetings with the ¶ general public and all stakeholde. Part of ¶ the constituency will not like what you do, ¶ whatever you do. [Because of] a demographic ¶ shift to a population-base of retirees from ¶ other states, as summer-home visitors to our ¶ beautiful coast became year-round residents,¶ …coastal communities now view the ocean for ¶ ‘recreational use,’ and commercial fishermen ¶ and aquaculturists must make their case locally ¶ to people who have no history or link with the ¶ ocean for making a living” (Thomas, 2011).

#### Opposition outweighs support due to the small nature of the industry

Knapp 2012 [Gunnar Knapp Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, “The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture” Bull. Fish. Res. Agen. No. 35, 51-63, 2012 https://www.fra.affrc.go.jp/bulletin/bull/bull35/35-7.pdf]

But being new and small also raises political ¶ challenges for U.S. marine aquaculture. Because it ¶ is new and small, it is harder to demonstrate the ¶ benefits and easier to exaggerate the risks of marine ¶ aquaculture (Figure 3). As noted by Tiersch and ¶ Hargreaves (2002), new resource industries such as aquaculture face a different political playing field ¶ than older resource industries such as logging:¶“A core concept of the environmental ¶ movement is the precautionary principle, ¶ which basically states that it is wise to avoid ¶ unnecessary risk… This principle is biased ¶ towards slowing or stopping the development ¶ of new activities, and shifts the burden ¶ of proof from environmental advocates to ¶ practitioners such that new activities, like ¶ aquaculture, must show that they will not be ¶ a problem in the future. This is in contrast ¶ to the situation for established industries － ¶ detractors must prove that the established ¶ industry presents a problem. Of course, newer ¶ industries also lack the financial and political ¶ resources of groups such as logging, mining ¶ and petroleum extraction interests and large ¶ chemical corporations. It is easier to restrict or ¶ stop aquaculture projects, despite their much ¶ smaller environmental risk than it is to attempt ¶ to control more damaging established activities. ¶ Thus opposing aquaculture development is ¶ viewed by advocacy groups as applying an ¶ ounce of prevention now instead of the pound of ¶ cure that would be required later.”¶ 　To overcome the political challenges it faces, U.S. ¶ marine aquaculture will need committed supporters ¶ at all levels of the political and policy process. It ¶ will need fish farmers and employees who tell their ¶ friends and neighbors and elected officials about the ¶ benefits of aquaculture. It will need supporters who ¶ will testify at local public meetings, write letters to ¶ the editor, and are elected to local, state, and federal ¶ office. It will need organized lobbying efforts to ¶ influence state and federal agencies and politicians. ¶ All of this takes committed people and money.¶ 　Because U.S. marine aquaculture is new and small, ¶ relatively few Americans have － or realize they ¶ have － a direct stake in it. That means that it has ¶ fewer committed supporters, with less money and ¶ less political influence. In much of the United States ¶ marine aquaculture is still below a political threshold ¶ scale necessary for people to understand, accept, ¶ and effectively advocate for marine aquaculture. ¶ Achieving this scale will be critical to overcoming ¶ political challenges. Marine aquaculture will become ¶ politically stronger as it grows － but it is difficult ¶ for it to grow without being politically stronger.

#### Philosophical resistance of Americans to ownership of public goods

Knapp 2012 [Gunnar Knapp Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, “The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture” Bull. Fish. Res. Agen. No. 35, 51-63, 2012 https://www.fra.affrc.go.jp/bulletin/bull/bull35/35-7.pdf]

The tradition that marine fish and waters ¶ are public resources imposes an extra political ¶ and regulatory hurdle for the development of ¶ aquaculture, especially for finfish farming. Before ¶ any kind of marine aquaculture can begin, new ¶ mechanisms need to be created to allow for ¶ exclusive use of marine waters.¶ 　Efforts to implement rights-based management ¶ regimes for wild fisheries, such as individual fishing ¶ quotas, face similar strong philosophical resistance ¶ from many Americans. However, as these new ¶ management regimes are implemented, public ¶ attitudes are likely to shift as the economic logic and ¶ advantages of exclusive use rights become more ¶ apparent. The same process will likely occur with ¶ marine aquaculture － but it will take time.

#### You can’t sway people- attempts to spin the plan in a positive light are overwhelmed

Knapp 2012 [Gunnar Knapp Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, “The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture” Bull. Fish. Res. Agen. No. 35, 51-63, 2012 https://www.fra.affrc.go.jp/bulletin/bull/bull35/35-7.pdf]

These groups’ opposition is vexing and frustrating ¶ to marine aquaculture supporters who feel that the ¶ objections and fears of aquaculture opponents are ¶ exaggerated, unfounded, or simply irrational. How do ¶ you argue with people who － without any scientific ¶ basis － believe that marine aquaculture will destroy commercial fisheries? How do you argue with people ¶ who claim that fish farms that will be barely visible ¶ will destroy their coastal view? How do you argue ¶ with people who appear to be unwilling to accept ¶ any level of risk or change?¶ 　The political reality is that it is rational for groups ¶ which perceive only negative potential effects of ¶ marine aquaculture to oppose it. Why accept any ¶ risk if there is nothing to be gained?

#### Powerful NGO’s oppose it to and affect the public debate

Knapp 2012 [Gunnar Knapp Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, “The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture” Bull. Fish. Res. Agen. No. 35, 51-63, 2012 https://www.fra.affrc.go.jp/bulletin/bull/bull35/35-7.pdf]

NGO’s have systematically and effectively ¶ opposed U.S. marine aquaculture: Numerous U.S. ¶ Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have ¶ invested significant funding and effort to advocate ¶ banning, delaying, restricting, or regulating U.S. ¶ marine aquaculture in ways that increase the ¶ risks and costs of investment. Collectively these ¶ organizations have played a major role in influencing ¶ the public, the press, politicians, and regulators in ¶ ways which have contributed to unfavorable leasing ¶ and regulatory policies towards marine aquaculture.¶ 　NGOs that have funded or engaged in significant ¶ advocacy to influence U.S. marine aquaculture ¶ policies include the Packard Foundation, the Moore ¶ Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, Greenpeace, ¶ the Environmental Defense Fund, Food and Water ¶ Watch, and others, both large and small. The scale, ¶ objectives, strategies, and arguments of these groups ¶ vary widely, making it difficult to generalize about ¶ their motives, methods, and effects. All of these ¶ organizations would assert that they use rational and ¶ science-based arguments to advocate for the public ¶ interest. Marine aquaculture supporters would argue ¶ that the NGOs engaged in aquaculture advocacy ¶ range from responsible to grossly irresponsible and ¶ that they pursue strategies ranging from ethical to ¶ grossly unethical.¶ As noted by Tiersch and Hargreaves (2002), ¶ “Advocacy groups can provide a valuable service ¶ by acting as an impartial watchdog of environmental ¶ issues and calling attention to legitimate concerns.” ¶ However, a very real and frustrating challenge for ¶ marine aquaculture supporters is that some NGOs ¶ appear willing to say anything to oppose marine ¶ aquaculture, with casual and sometimes blatant ¶ disregard for objectivity, truth, or the complex ¶ reality of what experience and science have shown ¶ about the hugely varied effects of the hugely varied ¶ kinds of activities collectively known as aquaculture. ¶ Here, for example is a statement posted on the ¶ website of the NGO Food and Water Watch:¶“Many fish-lovers would be horrified to ¶ learn that huge quantities of fish and shrimp ¶ are now being grown in giant nets, cages, ¶ and ponds where antibiotics, hormones and ¶ pesticides mingle with disease and waste. These ¶ industrialized aquaculture facilities are rapidly ¶ replacing natural methods of fishing that have ¶ been used to catch fresh, wild seafood for ¶ millennia.” It is difficult for people in industry, government ¶ or science to refute these kinds of arguments when ¶ they are held to much higher standards of argument ¶ and evidence.

#### Science media has biased people against it

Knapp 2012 [Gunnar Knapp Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, “The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture” Bull. Fish. Res. Agen. No. 35, 51-63, 2012 https://www.fra.affrc.go.jp/bulletin/bull/bull35/35-7.pdf]

A familiar and frustrating experience for ¶ marine aquaculture supporters is the appearance ¶ in respected scientific journals, such as Science ¶ and Nature, of articles of questionable scientific ¶ validity or objectivity that claim to demonstrate ¶ negative effects of marine aquaculture － such as ¶ environmental damage or health risks of aquaculture ¶ products (Naylor et al., 2000; Hites et al., 2004). ¶ In some cases the research was funded by NGOs ¶ with the specific stated objective of demonstrating ¶ negative effects － as opposed to objectively ¶ examining the evidence for such effects (Krause, ¶ 2010a; b; Krause, 2011a; b). These articles then ¶ receive extensive attention in the popular press － ¶ often ensured by planned publicity campaigns of ¶ the sponsoring NGOs. The other side of the story ¶ － objective scientific review and critiques of the ¶ research methodology and conclusions － is rarely ¶ heard. It is rarely heard in the review processes of ¶ the scientific journals. It is rarely heard in the pages ¶ of scientific journals, which rarely publish rebuttal ¶ articles. It is rarely heard in the popular press, ¶ which is less interested in the other side of the story ¶ because it’s more confusing and nuanced and is ¶ less interesting － and because marine aquaculture ¶ supporters have no organized, planned publicity ¶ campaign to tell the other side of the story. Put ¶ simply, both scientific and press articles are easier ¶ to publish and get more attention if they indicate ¶ that aquaculture is bad than if they suggest that the ¶ studies that say aquaculture is bad are flawed.¶ 　With the public, politicians, and regulators facing a ¶ relentless barrage of negative messages from NGOs ¶ and the scientific and popular press, fish farmers ¶ face an uphill political battle (Figure 5).

#### Some are hesitant about aquaculture because of its use of antibiotics.

Food & Water Watch, March 15, 2006, "Factory Fish Farming" http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/common-resources/fish/fish-farming/

Many fish-lovers would be horrified to learn that huge quantities of fish and shrimp are now being grown in giant nets, cages, and ponds where antibiotics, hormones and pesticides mingle with disease and waste. These industrialized aquaculture facilities are rapidly replacing natural methods of fishing that have been used to catch fresh, wild seafood for millennia. From all-you-can-eat popcorn shrimp at chain restaurants, to bite-sized maki rolls at trendy sushi bars, to salmon steaks on the backyard barbecue – Americans eat 25 percent more seafood than they did 20 years ago, an average of 16 pounds a year.

#### Fishermen, Costal Residents, and Environmentalists are Strongly Against Aquaculture.

PanoramaAcuicola,1/9/13, "The Political Economics of United States Marine Aquaculture" http://www.panoramaacuicola.com/interviews\_and\_articles/2013/01/09/the\_political\_economics\_of\_united\_states\_marine\_aquaculture.html

**A variety of groups of Americans perceive potential negative effects of marine aquaculture. These include commercial fishermen, coastal residents, and environmentalists**. These groups play significant roles in the politics of United States marine aquaculture, across the political and regulatory process at local, state, and national levels. For example, **Alaska salmon fishermen spearheaded the Alaska legislature’s 1990 ban on finfish farming, and continue to vocally oppose aquaculture development in federal waters nation wide,** along with Alaska’s congressional delegation. Similarly, **coastal residents have strongly and effectively opposed marine aquaculture in states such as Maine and Washington. Part of the application process for the series of permits and licenses needed to operate in the marine environment is an exhaustive series of meetings with the general public and all stake holders**. Because of a demographic shift to a population-base of retirees from other states, as summer-home visitors became year-round residents, coastal communities now view the ocean for recreational use,’ and commercial fishermen and aquaculturists must make their case locally to people who have no history or link with the ocean for making a living. It is rational for groups which perceive only negative potential effects of marine aquaculture to oppose it. Clearly there are many things to be gained from marine aquaculture; such as stable jobs, tax revenues, and synergies with other marine industries. But, in many areas, aquaculture supporters have failed to make the case effectively that aquaculture has these positive potential benefits.

### Adv Link--- Climate Policy Unpopular

#### Plan unpopular – climate focus alienates the public

Real Clear Politics 5-11 (2014, Salena Zito, “'Climate' a Huge Threat - to Democrats in Washington”

<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2014/05/11/climate_a_huge_threat_-_to_democrats_in_washington_122600.html#ixzz32OgkzL57>)

No one knows yet if Dutton will win his bid for Congress; he is just one candidate in a five-person Republican primary in Georgia's 12th Congressional District, fighting to face U.S. Rep. John Barrow, an Augusta Democrat. One thing Dutton already has won is the sentiment of a country dumbfounded that President Barack Obama last week defined climate change as the most pressing issue facing the country. Obama did so as part of a huge public relations campaign — yes, campaign — that included asking people to pressure Washington to act on the issue. Not jobs. Not the economy. Not rebuilding our aging infrastructure. Not gang violence, or education. Climate change. And he and his party ridiculed anyone who disagrees. A couple of things about all of this smack the sensibilities of regular folks. First, most people know Earth's climate always has changed; everyone knows about this little thing called the Ice Age. What most people don't care for is the issue being used politically to slice and dice the country, the same way the minimum wage, gender, race, immigration and religion have been used by this administration. This is why folks do not look toward Washington, D.C., to solve problems anymore. This is why young people — the Millennials — are so turned off by the brands of both political parties, a one-time advantage that Democrats have completely squandered. And this is why we have wave-election cycles. Also, most folks who don't live in the privileged enclaves of high society or high academia or high government would argue that other, more pressing crises — most of them hidden in plain sight — should be considered the gravest threat to our country in our lifetime. Things such as subpar graduation rates in our inner-city schools, or the 90 million people who have left the nation's workforce in the past six years, or our economy being less entrepreneurial now than at any point in the last three decades — or that a Brookings study showed, between 2009 and 2011, small businesses were collapsing faster than they were being formed. AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka cautioned Obama and Democrats to consider how millions of livelihoods outside of D.C. would be impacted: “We are prepared to ... make sacrifices, but not while the most privileged in our society stand on the sidelines and expect our poorest communities to bear the costs.” A wave election is building beyond Washington — not a tsunami, but a wave — yet most experts don't see it because they define an electoral “wave” as a large flip to the party in power; Republicans already control the House and probably will add more seats to their list. Those experts should review the results of November's races for state legislatures, governors' mansions and the U.S. Senate, and then rethink their definition of a wave. And Democrats should rethink what really constitutes a “pressing issue.”

#### Climate policies are unpopular – trends

New York Times 10 (Jan 26, Alex Kaplun, ClimateWire, If Polls Say 'Yes' to a Climate Bill, Why Do Lawmakers Say 'Maybe'? <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/01/26/26climatewire-if-polls-say-yes-to-a-climate-bill-why-do-la-41121.html?pagewanted=all>)

Should climate change legislation move to the forefront of the national political debate, that does not mean the current levels of support for a bill will remain constant, as support for seemingly popular ideas can fall off the cliff once it becomes the dominant issue of the day. Democrats would have to look no further than health care reform, where public support has fallen as the debate has dragged on. Another example cited by some pollsters is President George W. Bush's effort to reform social security -- an idea that tested well initially but whose support quickly collapsed as the Capitol Hill debate got under way. "It's unclear if this were to move up on the agenda, whether those numbers would change or not," said Doherty of Pew. "At this point, it's a gut-level response to something that most voters probably haven't thought very much about." The polls have already shown some troubling signs for climate change supporters. The Washington Post poll, for example, which showed 65 percent for climate change legislation in December, showed 75 percent support just six months earlier. The 54 percent support found in the NBC News/Wall Street Journal represented a drop of 2 percentage points from just a couple months earlier but a 10-percentage-point drop from 2007. And a Pew poll released in the fall showed a drop of 14 points in the percentage of voters that believed there is solid evidence that the Earth is warming and a 9-percentage-point drop in the voters that saw global warming a "serious" problem -- one of several polls that has shown increased voter skepticism over the issue. "There's a lot of movement going on here, which makes people even more uneasy," Borick said. "There may still be majority support, but the trend lines are going in the other direction."

### A2 Climate Policy Popular

#### Support for climate legislation is cursory – Americans support it in the abstract, but the real-life costs aren’t popular

New York Times 10 (Jan 26, Alex Kaplun, ClimateWire, If Polls Say 'Yes' to a Climate Bill, Why Do Lawmakers Say 'Maybe'? <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/01/26/26climatewire-if-polls-say-yes-to-a-climate-bill-why-do-la-41121.html?pagewanted=all>)

Independent media polls have shown roughly the same results. A Washington Post-ABC News poll released just before Christmas showed that 65 percent wanted the federal government to regulate greenhouse gas emissions; an NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll a few days earlier placed that voter support for government action at 54 percent. But if the adage that politicians follow public opinion is true, why are so many key lawmakers still on the fence over the legislation? Why are politically endangered Democrats hesitant to support a bill that the polls say that voters actually like? And why does the seemingly popular legislative item continue to slide further and further down the congressional agenda? Answering those questions could be pivotal for the future of climate legislation, as both sides admit that the fate of the bill could be determined just as much by public opinion as by the actual policy language in the legislation. Environmentalists and their allies say it takes time to connect public sentiment with political behavior, and many lawmakers do not have a firm grasp of how the public views this issue or how it can benefit them on the campaign trail. "There are frequently positions that politicians take that are out-of-step with America," said Joel Benenson, head of Benenson Strategy Group, which conducted its poll for the coalition Clean Energy Works. "I think that when you campaign and you create a narrative about whether a candidate is siding with special interests like oil companies and Wall Street is opposed to creating energy independence, capping pollution, regulating the financial industry, I think that's a pretty good argument for a Democrat to have against a Republican in a lot of races right now." Some lawmakers say their colleagues' perception of public opinion has been muddied by efforts launched by a handful of powerful interests to defeat the bill. "Some folks, I don't think are listening to people on the ground -- this is a battle between public sentiment and special interests," said Rep. Jay Inslee (D-Wash.), an ardent supporter of the climate change bill. "Over time, the public sentiment has started to prevail." But critics and some polling experts see the matter differently. They say that while the public may indeed articulate surface-level support for climate change legislation, that sentiment fails to adequately reflect two important factors in any political debate -- cost and voter engagement. "When you ask people in an isolated way do they want to do something to address the problem, they say, 'yes,'" said Christopher Borick, director of the Muhlenberg College Institute of Public Opinion. "When you give them financial implications, those numbers start to erode." Borick added, "Political figures just do not sense a deep commitment; they see it as a cursory commitment to action rather than a deep commitment that would include financial support." Yesterday, the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press reported that 28 percent of voters believed that dealing with global warming should be a "top domestic priority" for President Obama. That number put it dead last among the 21 topics covered by the poll and at its lowest level since Pew started testing the issue in 2007. Addressing the country's "energy problem" came in at 49 percent -- an 11 percentage point drop from last year and the lowest since 2006. "There's more support than opposition for it, but people haven't heard a lot about this," said Carroll Doherty, associate director of the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. "This issue is off the radar for a lot of people."

### Adv Link--- Econ Policy Unpopular

#### Econ focus causes dem disenchantment – general improvements don’t hit home for voters

AIM 5/13 (2014, Accuracy in Media Newswire, “Reuters Claims “Rising U.S. Economy” could save Democrats in 2014 Midterm Elections” <http://www.aim.org/newswire/reuters-claims-rising-u-s-economy-could-save-democrats-in-2014-midterm-elections/>)

WASHINGTON — A Reuters analysis, written by Richard Cowan, alleged that the U.S. economy is becoming stronger. He started his piece with the following: “Here’s a riddle: Many Republicans deny it’s happening. Some Democrats don’t want to talk about it. What is it? The answer is the growing U.S. economy, on pace to expand as much as 3.5 percent this year, about the best performance in the industrialized world. Unemployment has fallen from 10 percent to about 6.3 percent and consumer confidence is at a six-year high.” Yet, when you take an average of several polls, as the website RealClearPolitics does, you find that Americans are not hot on Obama either. He has not had an approval rating higher than his disapproval rating since June of last year. Gallup polls have also reiterated how bleak the U.S. economy has been under Obama. 55% of polled voters in their weekly poll on the state of the economy said the economy was getting worse, compared to about 40% who felt the economy was improving. According to the same weekly poll, the last time that voters felt the economy was improving was in June 2013 by a 49-45 split. Even a strategist at a firm whose clients are Democratic candidates, Erica Seifert, was quoted as saying: “It’s bad for Democrats to make the argument the economy is improving. Bad, bad, bad.” Why are Americans so down on the economy? As Cowan paraphrased some of Seifert’s remarks, it is because “many American voters see an economic landscape still littered with long-term joblessness, stagnant wages and excessive personal debt.”

#### Econ focus unpopular – *improvement* is popular, but too many voters don’t feel the effects

Reuters 5/12 (2014, Richard Cowan, “Rising U.S. economy could help Democrats stave off election loss” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/05/12/us-usa-campaign-congress-analysis-idUSBREA4B01Z20140512>)

"Signs of life in the economy could be a major plus for the Democrats," wrote Greg Valliere of Potomac Research Group in an April 21 note to subscribers. "Most Americans still think we're in a recession (it ended in June of 2009), but attitudes could change by Labor Day, which would give Democrats a crucial boost" in November, he said. For now, too many Americans are not feeling the effects of an improving economy, said Ron Bonjean, a longtime Republican strategist and partner at Singer Bonjean Strategies. "You need to have three or four months of solid job growth on the national and local level," he said, adding, "The number of people dropping out (of the labor force) needs to slow down" before Obama and his Democrats can even start touting it.

## Republicans Good

### Generic--- Ocean Development Popular

#### Most Americans Support Offshore Development Programs – energy dependence concerns

Lilley 10 (Summer, Jonathan Charles, PhD in Marine Biology, “NAVIGATING A SEA OF VALUES: UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD THE OCEAN AND OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES” <http://www.ceoe.udel.edu/windpower/resources/J_Lilley_8-03_FINAL.pdf>)

The analysis conducted in Chapter 5 highlights a number of important issues regarding support levels for offshore oil drilling and wind development. The data show that whereas a majority of respondents support both forms of energy development, offshore wind is favored by more. Again these findings relate to public opinion in 2008 – a more detailed discussion of how people’s views might have changed is provided below. Large differences exist between Republicans and Democrats, men and women, and those with at least some college education and those without. Interestingly, no significant differences between support levels were found among the various regions, and both coastal and inland residents have a similar outlook to offshore energy development. Of the reasons why people support offshore drilling, reducing the country’s dependence on foreign oil is the clear favorite. For offshore wind, the allure of developing a clean energy source proves to be most popular, although both reducing dependence on foreign oil and creating green jobs resonate with the public as well. Of those who oppose either oil or wind development, the threat of environmental damage is the main concern. The notion that enough wind power exists on land to disregard the need for development offshore is also found in the data, along with the sentiment that the country should be reducing the amount of oil it uses, a finding which in itself is very revealing. The data here strongly imply that the idea of reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil is starting to take hold. However, neither cost, risk of environmental damage, nor a lack of reliable technology is the reason why people think the U.S. does not currently have any offshore wind facilities. Instead, blame is directed at the government as well as oil and gas companies who many Americans believe, rightly or not, are hindering development of the resource

### Aquaculture Popular

#### Ag groups support offshore aquaculture development

Hart 2014 [Steven Hart 2-12-2014 Hagstrom Report “Soybean industry plans aquaculture promotion” http://www.hagstromreport.com/2014news\_files/2014\_0212\_soybean-industry-plans-aquaculture-promotion.html]

SEATTLE — The United States needs to develop a much larger aquaculture industry based on feeding fish soybeans and other plants to meet the growing demand for fish in the United States and other countries in the coming years.¶ That is the provocative goal of the Coalition for U.S. Seafood Production, a soybean-industry led group whose formation was announced here this week on the sidelines of the World Aquaculture Society meeting.¶ The coalition, to be known by the acronym CUSP, is an outgrowth of the Soy Aquaculture Alliance, which has been funded for several years by the United Soybean Board and state checkoffs, to create a bigger market for fish food made from soybeans.¶ “We believe establishing relationships and building connections among soy, aquaculture and seafood value chain stakeholders is crucial to helping aquaculture catch on,” said Steven Hart, the executive director of the Indiana-based Soy Aquaculture Alliance. “This is imperative as wild-capture fish production cannot sustainably meet the rising global demand for seafood in the decades ahead.”¶ There is already a substantial market for plant-based fish food in the U.S. catfish and farm-raised trout and tilapia industries, but the big market for soybean-based fish food is overseas in Chile, Norway and developing countries where big fish farms are located.¶ CUSP, whose members include the soybean industry, aquaculture farmers, customers such as Darden Restaurants and academics involved in fish research, will encourage the executive branch and Congress to help expand U.S. aquaculture, Hart said.¶ The coalition’s goals are supported by a recent report by the World Bank, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Food Policy Research Institute predicting that by 2030, 62 percent of fish for human food will come from aquaculture because fish catches in the wild are expected to level off amid rising demand for low-cost protein from a growing middle class, especially in China.¶ The FAO also found that the United States has some of the world’s best potential locations for offshore fish farming.¶ But U.S. aquaculture faces a range of regulatory issues involving the Commerce Department’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the Agriculture Department’s various research agencies, Interior’s Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency. State and local governments are also involved in permitting fish farms.¶ Environmentalists often ring alarm bells about the dangers of fish farming due to pollution and escapes, but the Monterey Bay Aquarium, whose seafood watch advises consumers on what fish to eat, has endorsed it as long as production standards are high. (See story below.)¶ Aquaculture industry officials, meanwhile, warn that if authorities in the United States do not approve facilities, the industry will expand in other countries where permitting is easier.¶ Lobbying to date¶ The coalition has already met with Obama administration officials and with some members of Congress, and says it has convinced the administration to create a place for aquaculture in a new oceans policy.¶ Hart said that although the group was told that there would be no specific mention of aquaculture in the policy, when the report came out three weeks later, it was included in several places.¶ “As a group we are not doing enough to encourage aquaculture development,” Hart said. “Members of Congress say they have never heard about it and ask why the industry is not doing more.”¶ Hart said the coalition’s goals include finalizing a fishery management plan for marine aquaculture in the Gulf of Mexico, reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevenson Marine Fisheries Management Act, which guides NOAA’s activities related to aquaculture, and declaration of aquaculture as a “specialty crop” in the next farm bill, which would qualify it for certain Agriculture Department programs.

#### Aff builds support among environmental groups

Hart 2014 [Steven Hart 2-12-2014 Hagstrom Report “Soybean industry plans aquaculture promotion” http://www.hagstromreport.com/2014news\_files/2014\_0212\_soybean-industry-plans-aquaculture-promotion.html]

Michael Rubino, director of NOAA’s Office of Aquaculture, said his agency is primarily focused on managing fishing in federal waters, but that as aquaculture is becoming more popular, fishermen are becoming less resistant and environmentalists have begun to see it as a solution rather than a problem.¶ “These things are building a base of support for what you collectively would like to do in marine aquaculture,” he said.

#### Public support is building for aquaculture

The Fish Site 2007 [The Fish Site News Desk 17 April 2007 “Economic Benefit and Public Support for Aquaculture Confirmed” http://www.thefishsite.com/fishnews/4086/economic-benefit-and-public-support-for-aquaculture-confirmed]

A recent public opinion poll undertaken by Ipsos Reid on behalf of the BCSFA shows increasing support for sustainable aquaculture in British Columbia. A majority of respondents (65%) said they support the development of a sustainable salmon farming sector in BC; and less than one per cent identified salmon farming as the top environmental issue facing BC today.¶ These results complement an earlier survey commissioned by the Northwest Institute and undertaken by market research company, Synovate, which showed that 60 per cent of respondents believed salmon farming increased job opportunities and 41 per cent said a benefit of salmon farming was that it resulted in less pressure on wild salmon stocks.

#### Environmental Groups are currently becoming more lenient in fish farming.

**Scientific American, 1/15/10**, "Sea Change: Environmental Group Gives First-Time Nod to Sustainable Salmon-Farming Method"

**In a report released January 14, the Monterey Bay Aquarium's Seafood Watch program is taking the unprecedented step of approving a particular method for farming Pacific coho salmon that is currently employed exclusively by the Rochester**, Wash.–based AquaSeed Corp. The sustainability nod from the consumer education group means that these salmon also will be assigned a green "Best Choice" rating on Seafood Watch's Web site. **The approval follows several months of intensive site visits by Seafood Watch scientists and reviews** of the company's production facility, feed ratios, fish contaminant and pollution discharge levels, and more.

### Drilling Popular

#### Record high percentages of americans support offshore drilling

Gallup 11 (March 14, “U.S. Oil Drilling Gains Favor With Americans” <http://www.gallup.com/poll/146615/oil-drilling-gains-favor-americans.aspx>)

Bottom Line A solid majority of Americans currently favor increased offshore oil drilling in U.S. coastal areas and a record-high 49% favor opening the Alaskan wilderness to oil exploration. These trends might best be understood in terms of Americans' ongoing anxiety about the nation's economic problems coupled with their expectation that today's already elevated gas prices will continue to rise. While Americans care about environmental protection -- 61% in 2010 called themselves active in or sympathetic to the environmental movement -- the possible benefits of achieving greater oil independence may be gaining appeal.

### Drilling Popular: A2: Deepwater Horizon

#### Deepwater Horizon had no long-term impact on support

Pew Research 11 (April 19, “Offshore Drilling Support One Year after Gulf Oil Spill” <http://www.pewresearch.org/daily-number/offshore-drilling-support-one-year-after-gulf-oil-spill/>)

A year ago today, an explosion occurred on the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig that would eventually spill an immense amount of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. The accident had a sustainable effect on public support for drilling. The percentage of Americans favoring more oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters fell from 63% in February 2010 to 44% in June 2010. In a survey taken roughly a year after the disaster, however, support for drilling has rebounded, increasing 13 points from the June poll. In a March 2011 survey, 57% of the public favored more oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters while just 37% opposed it. While support for oil and gas drilling has increased across political groups in the past year, there is still a wide partisan divide. In the March 2011 survey, 81% of Republicans favored allowing more offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters, compared with 54% of independents and 46% of Democrats.

#### A majority of the public supports drilling – particularly post-Deepwater Horizon

New York Times 11 (June 16, Jody Broder “Americans Support Offshore Drilling, but Washington Wavers” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/17/business/energy-environment/17drilling.html?\_r=1&)

Since the beginning of 2010, Washington has caromed from a restrictive approach to drilling to a permissive policy closely mirroring that of the Bush administration to a near-total shutdown of offshore drilling after the Deepwater Horizon blowout in the Gulf of Mexico. After that fatal accident, the administration decreed a deepwater drilling moratorium, lifted it six months later, then took five more months before beginning to issue drilling permits. Throughout that time, the American public’s attitudes toward domestic oil and gas development have been remarkably consistent: Americans are in favor of it, though Democrats and those on the coasts are much less likely than Republicans and those in the South and Southwest to be supportive. National support for offshore drilling and for domestic oil and gas development generally dipped for a time after the BP disaster — from a strong majority to a bare majority — but quickly rebounded. A Gallup poll taken immediately after the gulf spill showed that 50 percent of Americans supported offshore drilling while 46 percent opposed it. By March of this year, public support had risen to 60 percent versus 37 percent. The administration’s offshore drilling policy, like its fervor for domestic production more generally, has gone through rapid changes. In March 2010, President Obama announced that the United States would make vast tracts of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic and Arctic oceans available for leasing by oil and gas companies. After the BP spill began on April 20, 2010, he declared those areas off-limits for at least five years. Then, last month, the president announced that he would permit accelerated development in Alaska, the gulf and along parts of the Atlantic coast. Administration officials defend the policy changes as reasonable responses to changed circumstances.

### Offshore Wind Popular

#### Americans love offshore wind – clean energy, oil dependence, and blame the government for failure to develop

Lilley 10 (Summer, Jonathan Charles, PhD in Marine Biology, “NAVIGATING A SEA OF VALUES: UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD THE OCEAN AND OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES” <http://www.ceoe.udel.edu/windpower/resources/J_Lilley_8-03_FINAL.pdf>)

The analysis conducted in Chapter 5 highlights a number of important issues regarding support levels for offshore oil drilling and wind development. The data show that whereas a majority of respondents support both forms of energy development, offshore wind is favored by more. Again these findings relate to public opinion in 2008 – a more detailed discussion of how people’s views might have changed is provided below. Large differences exist between Republicans and Democrats, men and women, and those with at least some college education and those without. Interestingly, no significant differences between support levels were found among the various regions, and both coastal and inland residents have a similar outlook to offshore energy development. Of the reasons why people support offshore drilling, reducing the country’s dependence on foreign oil is the clear favorite. For offshore wind, the allure of developing a clean energy source proves to be most popular, although both reducing dependence on foreign oil and creating green jobs resonate with the public as well. Of those who oppose either oil or wind development, the threat of environmental damage is the main concern. The notion that enough wind power exists on land to disregard the need for development offshore is also found in the data, along with the sentiment that the country should be reducing the amount of oil it uses, a finding which in itself is very revealing. The data here strongly imply that the idea of reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil is starting to take hold. However, neither cost, risk of environmental damage, nor a lack of reliable technology is the reason why people think the U.S. does not currently have any offshore wind facilities. Instead, blame is directed at the government as well as oil and gas companies who many Americans believe, rightly or not, are hindering development of the resource

#### Offshore wind enjoys broad-based public support

Lilley 10 (Summer, Jonathan Charles, PhD in Marine Biology, “NAVIGATING A SEA OF VALUES: UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD THE OCEAN AND OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES” <http://www.ceoe.udel.edu/windpower/resources/J_Lilley_8-03_FINAL.pdf>)

Offshore wind development enjoys strong public support. Although some specific projects, such as Cape Wind, have come under criticism from local opposition groups, others enjoy considerable support (e.g., Bluewater Wind), and overall there is broad support among both coastal and inland residents for installing offshore wind turbines. The issue also appears to be apolitical, with high levels of support from both Democrats and Republicans. While the survey also found that a majority supported (at least in 2008) offshore drilling, both coastal and inland residents are less enthusiastic about drilling than they are about wind development. Additionally, offshore drilling does not enjoy the same level of cross-party support that wind power does.

### Ocean Exploration Popular

#### Exploration and conservation efforts are popular – the plan makes ocean issues salient (because it removes abstraction)

Reese 13 (Jess, Chicago zoological society, interpretive programs coordinator (research specialist), “Assessing Interest in Sustainable Seafood through Strategically Framed Interpretive Statements” Journal of Interpretation Research 18(1) <http://www.interpnet.com/docs/JIR-v18n1.pdf>)

Most Americans consider themselves sympathetic to the environmental movement, but admit that they are not actively involved (The Ocean Project, 2009). In this regard, free-choice learning environments are prime venues for communicating information in order to increase involvement. The Ocean Project’s survey (2011) shows that the vast majority of the American public is concerned about ocean conservation issues. Far from apathy, the source of their inaction and disengagement with ocean conservation is a lack of urgency, due in part to a gap in understanding why they must act now. During the spring of 2010, when the Deep Water Horizon oil spill occurred in the Gulf of Mexico, the event seemed to explode in the consciousness of the American public, as reflected by the intense media coverage. The spill pervaded conversation and discourse regarding the government’s responsibility in protecting the quality of the ocean (The Ocean Project, 2009) and even spurred a flurry of activity on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s website as the American public sought more in-depth information than the superficial coverage that CNN and MSNBC could provide (Falk & Dierking, 2010). The spill provided a concrete example of the fragility of the ocean and the intense need for advocacy to prevent such catastrophes. However, once the disaster disappeared from the 24-hour media coverage, the public returned to more “front-page” issues such as the sagging U.S. economy and the weak job market (The Ocean Project, 2011).

#### Public supports ocean exploration – an overwhelming majority favors government action

Spruill 97 (Vikki N., President and CEO of Ocean Conservancy since 2006, Executive Director, Sea Web (not profit strategic communications firm dedicated to ocean research) “U.S. PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES” Oceanography Vol. 10 No 3. <http://www.tos.org/oceanography/archive/10-3_spruill.pdf>)

Government Needs to Do More; Personal Action Preferred to Joining Organizations; Ocean Exploration Favored over Space In a country where polls indicate that the majority of the public wants the fed- eral government out of their lives, 85% said they believed the government needed to do more to help protect the ocean. Per- haps most surprisingly, an overwhelming number (72%) believed funding for ocean exploration was a more important priority than funding for space exploration (17%). Questioned on the kinds of actions people are prepared to take on behalf of the ocean, those polled indicated that Americans are most likely to engage in personal action and less likely to become involved in lobbying, participate in group activities, or join local or national envi- ronmental organizations. Roughly one- half (49%) said they would be almost cer- tain to recycle their used motor oil, and 42% said they would be almost certain to pick up litter at the beach. A much smaller number (20%) said they would be prepared to pay higher water bills to build better sewage treatment plants; 18% indi- cated that they would be very likely to contact politicians to urge they take posi- tive actions to help the ocean; 12% said they would join an environmental organi- zation; and only 10% said they would be almost certain to attend council or state legislative meetings on ocean issues. These personal actions are apparently not only the most appealing, they are also considered by those polled to be the most effective. Nearly three-quarters (70%) stated that recycling used motor oil would be a very effective action toward ocean protection; 63% said the same of picking up litter on the beach. In general, the poll suggests that Ameri- cans feel they have a responsibility to pro- tect the ocean. There was strong agreement (84%) with the statement "'we have a re- sponsibility to protect the ocean for future generations," and 82% strongly agreed that the "destruction of the ocean is a threat to the health of future generations."

#### Government exploration and protection policies are popular

Lilley 10 (Summer, Jonathan Charles, PhD in Marine Biology, “NAVIGATING A SEA OF VALUES: UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD THE OCEAN AND OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES” <http://www.ceoe.udel.edu/windpower/resources/J_Lilley_8-03_FINAL.pdf>)

It was noted at the beginning of this study that for policies to succeed they must have public backing and it seems clear from the data here that, at least in the abstract, policies aimed at protecting and preserving the ocean would have high levels of public support. However, it appears equally apparent that if ocean-related issues are placed against other issues, then public support for the ocean would be less robust. In terms of framing ocean issues, it is thus important to recognize this difference. The high level of support for ocean issues overall bodes well for those involved in ocean literacy. As Steel et al. (2005) note, improving public knowledge is vital for increasing public support for ocean policies, and the findings of this study support this assertion. Given the high levels of responsibility felt toward the ocean, it appears it is not apathy that is preventing the public from undertaking more pro-ocean behavior, but rather a lack of knowledge – in particular, knowledge regarding an individual’s personal impact on the ocean. In a general sense, most people (both coastal and inland residents) understand that one can affect the marine environment even when living far from it but people living inland are less likely to think their personal actions have an impact on the ocean. However, in saying this, it is important to acknowledge that despite levels of awareness concerning individual action being lower than those relating to societal responsibility toward the ocean, at 71% they are still remarkably high. The fact that seven in ten people believe their actions do affect the ocean provides a lever for advocacy that could be used by those working on ocean conservation efforts

### Adv Link--- Enviro Focus Popular

#### Public favors environmental policies – your polls are asking the wrong questions

Krosnick 10 (Jon, Woods Institute Senior Fellow and Stanford Professor of communication and political science “Opinion Polls Underestimate Americans’ Concern about the Environment: Tweaking the Most Important Question” <http://climatepublicopinion.stanford.edu/sample-page/research/opinion-polls-underestimate-americans-concern-about-the-environment-2/>)

When pollsters ask Americans to name the most important problem facing the country, fewer than 3 percent mention the environment. But when asked to name the most serious problem facing the planet if left unchecked, the environment and global warming rise to the top, according to a May 2010 study by Woods Institute Senior Fellow and Stanford Professor of communication and political science Jon Krosnick Krosnick and colleagues from Stanford University collaborated with the Associated Press to analyze the results of a recent Internet survey of 906 adults. When asked “What do you think is the most important problem facing the country today?” about 49 percent of respondents answered the economy or unemployment, while only 1 percent mentioned the environment or global warming. But when asked, “What do you think will be the most serious problem facing the world in the future if nothing is done to stop it?” 25 percent said the environment or global warming, and only 10 percent picked the economy. In fact, environmental issues were cited more often than any other category, including terrorism, which was only mentioned by 10 percent of respondents. “For years, the wording used in traditional surveys has systematically underestimated the priority that the public has placed on global warming and the environment,” Krosnick says. ”To fully understand public concern about these issues, traditional surveys should be asking a different question.” The results of the study confirmed that the phrasing of a question has an impact on the responses: “How a question is phrased can significantly change the results,” says Krosnick.

#### Voters want environmental policies

Yale Project on Climate Change Communication 4-22 (2014 “Americans want government action to protect the environment” http://environment.yale.edu/climate-communication/article/americans-want-government-action-to-protect-environment/)

Our recent national survey found that over half of Americans say Washington DC should make addressing water pollution (62%), developing sources of clean energy (61%), toxic waste (56%), and air pollution (54%) a “very high” or “high” priority. Nearly half also say the president and Congress should give high priority to the issues of damage to the Earth’s ozone layer (46%), loss of tropical rain forests (45%), and global warming (44%). The American public expects their representatives in Washington to take action to protect the environment.

### Adv Link--- Climate Policy Popular

#### Majority of Americans favor climate action – it’s the politics that’s slow to change

New York Times 10 (Jan 26, Alex Kaplun, ClimateWire, If Polls Say 'Yes' to a Climate Bill, Why Do Lawmakers Say 'Maybe'? <http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/01/26/26climatewire-if-polls-say-yes-to-a-climate-bill-why-do-la-41121.html?pagewanted=all>)

If one were to judge the fate of climate legislation based solely on public polling, it would appear that it is only a matter of time before the bill easily cruises through Congress and arrives on the president's desk.Hardly a week seems to go by without a new poll showing strong support for climate change legislation. And even though advocates on both sides have spent millions of dollars for or against the bill, those polling numbers have stayed fairly steady. Most polls show that at least a plurality, often a majority, of voters support climate change regulation, would like to see more government investment in renewable energy jobs, and believe that climate change is real and is caused by human activity. Just last week, environmental groups released two such surveys -- one from the Democratic polling firm Benenson Strategy Group and another from well-known Republican pollster Frank Luntz -- showing the same general patterns (Greenwire, Jan. 21). Independent media polls have shown roughly the same results. A Washington Post-ABC News poll released just before Christmas showed that 65 percent wanted the federal government to regulate greenhouse gas emissions; an NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll a few days earlier placed that voter support for government action at 54 percent. But if the adage that politicians follow public opinion is true, why are so many key lawmakers still on the fence over the legislation? Why are politically endangered Democrats hesitant to support a bill that the polls say that voters actually like? And why does the seemingly popular legislative item continue to slide further and further down the congressional agenda? Answering those questions could be pivotal for the future of climate legislation, as both sides admit that the fate of the bill could be determined just as much by public opinion as by the actual policy language in the legislation. Environmentalists and their allies say it takes time to connect public sentiment with political behavior, and many lawmakers do not have a firm grasp of how the public views this issue or how it can benefit them on the campaign trail. "There are frequently positions that politicians take that are out-of-step with America," said Joel Benenson, head of Benenson Strategy Group, which conducted its poll for the coalition Clean Energy Works. "I think that when you campaign and you create a narrative about whether a candidate is siding with special interests like oil companies and Wall Street is opposed to creating energy independence, capping pollution, regulating the financial industry, I think that's a pretty good argument for a Democrat to have against a Republican in a lot of races right now."

### A2 Climate Policy Unpopular

#### Protecting the environment is popular – even given the economy

Teixeira 12 (May 18, Ruy, a Fellow at both The Century Foundation and American Progress. He is also a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, where he has directed projects on political demography and geography and co-authored a series of papers with William Frey on the shifting demographics of battleground states, political scientist, author of seven books, Guest Contributor on ThinkProgress.Org “Public Opinion Snapshot: Americans Still Support Environmental Protection” <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/18/484238/public-opinion-snapshot-americans-still-support-environmental-protection/>)

Given today’s economic problems, you’d think the public would be in a surly mood about environmental protection, seeing it as a secondary and perhaps conflicting priority to jobs and economic growth. That’s certainly what conservatives are hoping as they continue to push their environment-wrecking agenda. Turns out, though, the public didn’t get the memo. In the recently released poll from Yale University’s and George Mason University’s climate change communication programs, 58 percent of poll respondents said that protecting the environment improves economic growth and creates new jobs. Just 17 percent thought environmental protection hurts growth and jobs, and 25 percent thought there was no effect. In the same poll, when asked to choose directly which was more important—environmental protection or economic growth—the public decisively favored protecting the environment 62 percent to 38 percent when there is a conflict between the two goals. So no, the bad economy has not turned the public off to environmental protection. Conservatives, if they are wise, will factor that into their political calculations.

### Adv Link--- Econ Push Popular

#### Bolstering the national economy is key to dem hopes in the midterms

WSJ 5/12 (2014, Wall Street Journal writer Gerald F. Seib “For Democrats, Midterm Peril Lies in the Public's Mood” <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303851804579557700794550322>)

The most striking characteristic of the public mood in 2014—and the area of most concern to Democrats—is the lack of economic confidence, seven years after the onset of the big recession that has hung over the Obama era. Just 26% of voters surveyed in the most recent Journal/NBC News poll late last month said the country was headed in the right direction, while 65% said it was on the wrong track. That's actually a worse reading than recorded in October 2010, when 31% of voters said the country was headed in the right direction and 60% said it was on the wrong track. Nor do people seem to see better times ahead. Just 27% of voters said the economy will improve in the next 12 months—again, a more pessimistic reading than in October 2010, when 37% said they thought the economy would improve. President Barack Obama's own approval ratings are quite similar to those of four years ago. In the most recent Journal/NBC News poll, his overall job approval among voters was 43%, versus 45% in October 2010. In the recent poll, 42% said they approved of the job he was doing handling the economy; four years ago, that reading was 43%. And on the key question of whether those surveyed wanted the outcome of the midterm election to be a Congress controlled by Democrats or by Republicans, Americans were evenly split, 45% to 45%, compared with 46% to 44% in favor of Republicans in October 2010. That even reading is a warning light for Democrats because they tend to have a harder time getting their supporters to turn out for midterm elections. Democrats know the key among all the numbers is the reading of economic confidence—which explains why you will see a lot more effort to convince middle-class voters that Democratic policies give them a better chance of moving ahead, even amid an economy that isn't so hot overall.

#### Economic improvement popular - it could independently stop the GOP from retaking the senate

Reuters 5/12 (2014, Richard Cowan, “Rising U.S. economy could help Democrats stave off election loss” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/05/12/us-usa-campaign-congress-analysis-idUSBREA4B01Z20140512>)

The anticipated economic upturn, Bowman said, "is not a game-changer" in the November elections, "But it could help a few Democrats" hold onto their seats, he said. With Republicans needing a net gain of six seats to win control of the Senate, a few seats turning in Democrats' favor due to the economy could determine whether Obama spends his last years in office with a divided Congress like now, or with one fully controlled by opposition Republicans. Senate Democrats are trying to defend 21 seats, compared to 14 being defended by Republicans. "There are some green shoots that could possibly portend a little difficulty" for Republicans going forward, said Karlyn Bowman, a senior fellow at the conservative-leaning American Enterprise Institute where she studies public opinion. And the pause in Washington's fiscal wars following last October's government shutdown has diminished the electorate's feeling of doom and gloom, Bowman said. That "will help incumbents" running this fall, she said. "Signs of life in the economy could be a major plus for the Democrats," wrote Greg Valliere of Potomac Research Group in an April 21 note to subscribers. "Most Americans still think we're in a recession (it ended in June of 2009), but attitudes could change by Labor Day, which would give Democrats a crucial boost" in November, he said.

#### Broadening Obama's economic agenda push solidifies Dem turnout in the midterms

Hamby 14 (Peter, CNN Political Reporter, "Democratic pollster predicts 'huge turnout disadvantage' in 2014," http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2014/03/25/democratic-pollster-predicts-huge-turnout-disadvantage-in-2014/)

Washington (CNN) - A leading Democratic pollster predicted a "sobering" turnout disadvantage for her party in this year's midterm elections and called on Democrats to articulate "a bigger economic agenda" this fall.¶ "There is a huge turnout disadvantage and challenge," Democratic pollster Celinda Lake said Tuesday at a breakfast with reporters. "There is always a challenge in turnout in an off year, but it's really dramatic this time."¶ Lake was speaking a breakfast hosted by the Christian Science Monitor. Lake and Republican pollster Ed Goeas revealed results of a new George Washington University poll that showed GOP voter intensity in 2014 outpacing Democratic intensity by seven points.¶ The poll indicated that 64% of Republicans say they are "extremely likely" to vote in November's midterms, compared with 57% of Democrats.¶ "I think we saw it play out in the Florida special," Lake said, referring to the GOP's special election victory earlier this month in Florida's 13th Congressional district. She called the Republican turnout machine in that race "darn effective," and said Democrats should not underestimate the GOP's get-out-the-vote operation this year.¶ "There are some people on our side who gloat about the Democrats' turnout advantage and kind of miss the Republican turnout operation," she said. "We tend to be dismissive of it, but it was very effective."¶ It's worth noting that voter intensity is an imprecise predictor of performance: In a George Washington University poll in mid-October 2012, weeks before President Obama won re-election and Democrats retained control of the Senate, Republicans had an 8-point lead over Democrats on the same likely-to-vote question.¶ Still, that was a presidential year, in which Democratic turnout jumped. Today, President Obama's approval ratings are grim, threatening midterm candidates in his party. Lake pointed to a several glimmers of hope for Democrats, though, including advantages over Republicans on issues like Medicare and Social Security that are important to older voters who play a larger role in non-presidential elections. As for the party base, she said "Democrats are very united and satisfied with their party."¶ What we learned from Florida-13¶ Lake said Democratic candidates must weave their policies and day-to-day campaign messages into a larger frame "solely focused on middle class populist economics."¶ "Democrats need to articulate a bigger economic agenda to really solidify this election," she said. "We talk about minimum wage, child care, and these are very popular policies. But we need a more muscular bigger economic agenda laid out there. "

#### Broader economic issue push allows Obama to boost Dem turnout - protects the Senate

Bedard 14 (Paul, Washington Examiner, "Democrats sweat over slumping support from single women, younger voters," http://washingtonexaminer.com/democrats-sweat-over-slumping-support-from-single-women-younger-voters/article/2546446)

¶ With voters depressed over the economy, upset with Obamacare and greatly disapproving of President Obama, Democrats are in a sweat over lackluster voter turnout in November when control of the Senate will be up for grabs.¶ ¶ New polling shows that Republicans are super-charged at getting a chance to vote against Democrats and Obama while two key Democratic voting groups, unmarried women and younger Americans, are checking out of the process.¶ ¶ “Turnout will be a major test for Democrats,” said pollster Celinda Lake. She called new polling data showing a 64 percent to 57 percent enthusiasm gap between Republicans and Democrats “pretty sobering.”¶ ¶ In midterm elections, Democrats typically lag Republicans in intensity by 10-15 points, but the gap is 17 points, she said.¶ ¶ A new George Washington University Battleground Poll, for example, found that just 36 percent of voters 18-29 are “extremely likely” to vote in the midterm elections. It's 38 percent for single women. Both were key Obama support groups in his two presidential elections.¶ ¶ The voter enthusiasm gap played out in the recent special election in Florida’s 13th Congressional District, where the GOP surprised the Democrats with an effective get-out-the-vote program — and victory.¶ ¶ Adding to the Democratic woes is the historic pattern of losses in the president’s party during his sixth year and just the fact that Obama isn’t on the ballot. “There is a huge turnout disadvantage and challenge,” said Lake, adding, “there is always a challenge in turnout in an off year, but it’s really dramatic this time.”¶ ¶ Worse, she said, as Democrats give up hopes of winning back the House to save the Senate, there is growing concerns that the GOP could hit House Democrats starved of money.¶ ¶ There is hope, however, and it is in the form of a broader middle class economic agenda than the White House is currently pushing, Lake advised.¶ ¶ In the poll, a majority disapprove of Obama’s handling of the economy, his ability to solve problems, and his effort to create jobs. To turn that around, Lake and others are encouraging the White House to bring before America a “more muscular bigger economic agenda” that also woos small businesses.

#### Economic issue push boosts Dem turnout in the midterms

Clift 14 (Elanor, Columnist @ Newseek + Daily Beast, "In New Poll, ‘Sobering’ News for Both Parties on Midterm Elections," http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/03/25/in-new-poll-sobering-news-for-both-parties-on-midterm-elections.html)

President Obama’s weak job-approval rating of 43 percent is a drag on his party, but Democrats hold the advantage over Republicans in key areas related to the middle class and have double-digit leads when it comes to protecting Social Security and Medicare. On the downside, the Democrats’ overriding weakness in turning out their vote in an off-year election is “reminiscent of 2010,” when a smaller, whiter, and older electorate elected a Republican House. The intensity that voters feel is what drives them to the polls, and Democrats typically lag behind Republicans by 10 or 15 points in the midterms. The Battleground poll measures the current intensity gap at 17 points. “Pretty sobering,” Lake said.¶ To boost turnout for Democrats, Lake advocates a “more muscular approach to the economy” even if Obama can’t get anything through Congress. “You can’t pass it but you can lay it out,” she said. “Republicans would like Obama to be up for reelection, but he’s not; Congress is up for reelection.” A bolder agenda from Obama that puts Congress on the defensive would highlight that distinction. Goeas countered that “Obama’s name is not on the ballot, but his policies are,” and Republicans are framing the fall election as a referendum on Obamacare.

#### Econ improvement helps dems – particularly if the plan moves up the timeline

Cassidy 5-9 (John Cassidy, the New Yorker, “A BLUFFER’S GUIDE TO THE MIDTERMS” <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/johncassidy/2014/05/a-bluffers-guide-to-the-midterms.html>)

Until now, the lacklustre recovery has been helping Republicans. In a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll, a remarkable seventy-six per cent of respondents said they believe the economy is still in a recession. The experts tell us that the Great Recession ended in June, 2009. And, during recent months, the rate of hiring has been picking up and the unemployment rate has fallen to 6.3 per cent. Most analysts, myself included, think the economy will show pretty strong growth through the summer and fall. That should help the Democrats. The question is whether it will come too late to turn around public sentiment. Most political analysts think it will—and that’s another reason they are bullish on the Republicans’ prospects.

# Internal Links

### Ocean Policy Swings Election

#### Even statements about ocean protection are historically divisive and controversial – 2012 election cycle proves

Bump 12 (30 Aug, Philip, former writer for the Gristmill, now the Atlantic Wire, Gristmill: “Romney treats climate as a punchline” http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:Ikqf7qkOvo0J:grist.org/news/romney-uses-the-bully-pulpit-to-mock-climate-change/+&cd=9&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us)

President Obama promised to begin to slow the rise of the oceans and to heal the planet. MY promise … is to help you and your family. This was one of the key points Mitt Romney made in the speech he gave Thursday night to officially accept the presidential nomination of the Republican Party. This was the speech immediately before the balloon drop, his primary sales pitch to undecided voters who hadn’t yet made up their minds. The quote was one of a few key passages Romney released to the press beforehand — one of the points the campaign thought were most important to get into newspaper articles before papers went to print. The quote Romney references here is from a speech Obama gave on June 3, 2008, the night he wrapped up the nomination for the Democratic Party. In context, it reads like this. The journey will be difficult. The road will be long. I face this challenge with profound humility, and knowledge of my own limitations. But I also face it with limitless faith in the capacity of the American people. Because if we are willing to work for it, and fight for it, and believe in it, then I am absolutely certain that generations from now, we will be able to look back and tell our children that this was the moment when we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless; this was the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal; this was the moment when we ended a war and secured our nation and restored our image as the last, best hope on Earth. This was the moment — this was the time — when we came together to remake this great nation so that it may always reflect our very best selves, and our highest ideals. Obama’s point, of course, was that he’d been endorsed to fight for what the Democratic Party believes in: a strong safety net, employment, addressing climate change, ending the war in Iraq, burnishing an image of the United States that had been gutted by the man then holding the office. In the past four years, he clearly hasn’t accomplished all of that; on many points, he’s fallen much shorter than Democrats had hoped. But this was a statement of intent, an exhortation to ideals. As soon as he gave the speech, the section about the ocean became a symbol for an opposition intent to portray Obama as an effete other. The next day, the clip was posted on YouTube, with the title “Obama Promises The World.” When you search for that phrase on Google during the latter part of 2008, the first site that returns a result is “ObamaMessiah.blogspot.com.” Obama’s claim that we might address the rise of the oceans was seen as a man claiming dominion over the universe, not as a sensible priority for a president in the year 2008. That year, Mitt Romney was also running for president, though his campaign had ended by the time Obama gave that speech. During that campaign in 2008, Romney admitted that climate change was occurring, and that humans were contributing to it. But Romney lost. So now, Mitt Romney derides the scientific fact of climate change as he finds better political success in the Republican primary. And he has embraced the support of those who wrung from Obama’s hopeful, excited words such bizarre insinuations. What Romney argues is a classic false choice: the idea that we must either choose to save the environment or put people to work. It’s the sort of argument that lets polluters squat in poor communities, insisting that they be allowed to do as they wish or they’ll take their jobs elsewhere. It’s a choice that need not be made, as demonstrated by green jobs and the burgeoning industries built around renewables and efficiency and sustainability. But that’s not actually what Romney was arguing. He was arguing that Obama is a weirdo who cares more about dolphins than Americans. That Romney will be there for the kids after school with a Wonder bread sandwich while Obama is nursing a spotted owl back to health with his halo.

#### Plan’s controversial – ocean policy is an election year *battleground*

Ocean Conservancy 12 (November 3, Nobody Benefits From Politicizing The Ocean <http://blog.oceanconservancy.org/2012/11/03/nobody-benefits-from-politicizing-the-ocean/>)

Over the past week, Hurricane Sandy has surged through the Caribbean and South Atlantic, slammed into the Mid-Atlantic and Northeast and affected over 60 million people across the Eastern Seaboard. With the flooding of thousands of homes, power outages sweeping the region, and first responders diligently responding to communities’ needs, this storm serves as a stark reminder that environmental impacts are not confined to political boundaries. Effective policy should not be, either. This week, the Washington Post examined the fervent bullying faced by the National Ocean Policy over the course of this election year and its role as a battleground for polarized election-year fights. Critics attempted to block funding for its implementation, claiming the policy served as an executive power grab, lacking in stakeholder involvement and increasing in bureaucratic red tape. However, blocking implementation of the National Ocean Policy could restrict agencies already struggling to maintain services vital to the health of our coastal communities, and will exacerbate conflicts between interests competing for space in our nation’s waters.

### Economy Swings Election

#### The economy will be the American public’s top priority in this year’s midterm elections.

Paul Steinhauser, Fri May 2, 2014 (CNN Political Editor) (“6 factors that will influence the midterms”) http://www.cnn.com/2014/05/02/politics/six-factors-midterms/

Say what you want about other issues, but the economy remains the top concern of Americans when it comes to their vote. "The economy is stronger than it's been in a very long time," Obama said at a news conference at the end of last year. By many metrics, he's right. The stock market has been in record territory again, unemployment's at a five-year low, auto sales are at a seven-year high and the housing sector, which dragged the country into recession five years ago, is rebounding. But many people just don't feel that good about things. National polling indicates most people don't feel nearly as optimistic about the economy and their personal plight. And a key economic indicator out earlier this week is helping. Gross domestic product, the broadest measure of economic activity, grew at a 0.1% annual pace in the first quarter of this year. While the numbers are probably just the winter weather effect, they add to the perception that the recovery is tepid. And a sluggish economy prevents Democrats from highlighting the issue in the midterms.

### Political Capital Link Module

#### Obama losing PC wrecks Dem chances in 2014

Steinhauser 5/2 (Paul Steinhauser, CNN Political Editor, “6 factors that will influence the midterms,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2014/05/02/politics/six-factors-midterms/)

Obama's numbers

The one name not on any ballot come November could arguably be the most important person in the midterms. Republicans are trying to frame the elections as a referendum on President Barack Obama, in hopes that the Democratic president serves as a drag on his party.¶ Obama's approval rating has hovered in the low to mid 40's this year in most non-partisan, live operator, national polling. That's slightly higher than where the President stood in November and early December, when his approval rating was at or near all time lows in many national surveys.¶ The approval rating is considered one of the best gauges of a president's standing with Americans and of his clout with lawmakers here in Washington. And during a midterm election year, the approval rating is constantly under the national spotlight, as it's considered a key indicator of how the president's political party may fare on Election Day.¶ Obama's approval rating is slightly better at this time in his presidency than his most recent predecessor, Republican George W. Bush.¶ "Low approval numbers usually spell bad news for the president's party. George W. Bush's rating was in the low to mid 30's in April of his sixth year and his party lost control of the House and Senate later that year. Richard Nixon got only a 26% approval rating in April of his sixth year and the GOP got hammered in the 1974 midterms," CNN Polling Director Keating Holland said.¶ "On the other hand, high approval rating don't always help. Ronald Reagan's approval rating was at 62% in April of 1986 and remained that high throughout the year, but his party still lost seats in the House and lost control of the Senate in the 1986 midterms," Holland added.¶ Keep a close eye on this important indicator. Where the President's approval ratings stand come the autumn will influence the midterm results.

### Midterms = Referendum on Obama

#### Obama gets the blame - midterms are a referendum on his performance

Podhoretz 3/18/14 (John, editor of Commentary magazine, columnist for the New York Post, the author of several books on politics, and a former presidential speechwriter, NY Post, "Obama’s failed foreign policy just another drag on Democrats," http://nypost.com/2014/03/18/obamas-failed-foreign-policy-just-another-drag-on-democrats/)

He is the president. It’s his watch. Americans may be war-weary, but they still look to the man in the White House to provide an overall sense of stability and safety.¶ Democrats need Americans to feel positively about the president going into the 2014 elections. All election experts say the party’s showing nationally in November will correlate strongly with how the country feels about the job the president is doing.

#### Midterms are a referendum on Obama

Steinhauser 3/4/14 (Paul, CNN Political Editor, "Eight things to watch in the eight months till Election Day," http://www.cnn.com/2014/03/04/politics/eight-months-till-election/)

7. The President -- poll numbers and fundraising: There's no denying that 2013 was a tough year for Obama. And with an approval rating hovering in the low 40s in most national opinion polls, the question is: How will he impact Democrats in November?¶ Midterm elections are often a referendum on a sitting president, so expect to see Obama's approval ratings in the spotlight right until the Election Day¶ While some Democrats facing tough re-elections in red or purple states are not inviting the President to join them out on the campaign trail, they do need his help raising money. When it comes to fundraising, Obama remains the Democratic party's top rainmaker, and he's picking up the pace this year in helping his party bring in the bucks, especially when compared with his efforts in the 2010 midterms.

#### Midterms will be a referendum on Obama

Cook 2/10/14 (Charlie, Political Analyst @ National Journal + Founder @ Cook Political Report, "The Path to Victory in 2014," http://www.govexec.com/oversight/on-politics/2014/02/path-victory-2014/78542/)

The Washington Post’s Chris Cillizza created something of a stir recently with his column headlined, “2014 Senate races may be a referendum on Obama; if so, Democrats should worry.”¶ Cillizza (a former Cook Political Report staffer) linked to the Gallup Organization’s just-released aggregation of all of its 2013 polling data, with President Obama’s job-approval and disapproval numbers broken down by state.¶ Cillizza observed that Obama has disapproval ratings over 50 percent in 10 of the 21 states where Democrats are defending Senate seats this year. The disapprovals were over 55 percent in open Democratic Senate seat states in West Virginia (67.3 percent), Montana (60.9 percent), and South Dakota (59.3 percent).¶ These disapproval numbers can also be seen in the two states represented by the most-endangered Democratic incumbents: Arkansas (57 percent), where Mark Pryor is facing the stiffest of all challenges, and Alaska (55.4 percent), where Mark Begich is fighting for reelection.¶ While Cillizza’s point is hardly earth-shattering, it is very important and worth keeping in mind. As much as anything, midterm elections tend to be a referendum on the incumbent president. When voters are unhappy, they tend to vote to punish the president’s party’s candidates. If voters are satisfied, they generally find some other basis on which to decide their vote. It may be unfair, but that’s the way it is.¶ As of late, Obama’s numbers have been languishing in the low 40s, occasionally dipping below 40 percent, while at other times reaching as high as 45 or 46 percent. The president’s disapproval numbers generally bounce around the 50 percent mark, half the time slightly higher, the other half a bit lower. Obama’s approval numbers are almost precisely tracking those of George W. Bush at this point in his presidency. But he is trailing far behind those of Ronald Reagan, who at this point had approval numbers in the low 60s, and Bill Clinton, who was in the high 50s.¶ Given this situation, the challenge for Democratic candidates is to ensure that the focal point of their campaigns is something other than Obama (and, one might add, the Affordable Care Act). In an optimal situation, Democrats should be able to put the focus on their Republican rivals’ flaws or miscues, real or imagined, thereby deflecting attention from Obama and the general disapproval that voters have with where the country is going. (The NBC News Political Unit recently found that the “right direction” number has not exceeded the “wrong track” in over 10 years, a startling sign of long-term discontent with the country’s leadership). Democratic opposition-research consultants will need to really earn their paychecks this year.

#### Midterms are a referendum on Obama – GOP will use unpopular policies to punish vulnerable Dems

Jackson 2/12/14 (David, USA Today, "Obama might be Democrats' biggest burden," lexis)

President Obama must confront one of the biggest issues in this year's congressional elections: President Obama himself.¶ The president wants his fellow Democrats to keep the Senate, would love to see them retake the House, and has made it clear he's willing to help -- but in some cases, the best thing he can do for Democratic candidates is to stay away.¶ If the Republicans have their way, Obama's record -- particularly the health care law -- will be front and center in the elections.¶ The GOP's major targets include seven Senate seats now held by Democrats in states that Obama lost in the 2012 election, and where his approval ratings in 2013 averaged 43% or less. And there are signs some Democrats are distancing themselves from Obama on issues such as the proposed Keystone oil pipeline and the economy in general.¶ "Every Democrat running this cycle has baggage of having supported Obama and his policies for years," said Kirsten Kukowski, spokeswoman for the Republican National Committee, citing health care in particular.¶ Democrats said Obama can and will be an asset for Democrats in November and that the health care law will be more popular by then.¶ Supporters noted that the president can raise tons of money. He can also galvanize the coalition that helped elect him in 2008 and 2012, including African Americans, Hispanics, progressives and single women.¶ "Nobody's got the ability to motivate the activist base and the donors more than the president," said Ben LaBolt, a former Obama campaign spokesman.¶ LaBolt said Obama should be "deployed in a strategic way that drives up turnout of that coalition in key states," including those with Republican incumbents.¶ The political challenges facing the sixth-year president figure to shadow the 2014 congressional elections. The White House and Democratic political organizations will have to decide when, where and how often Obama campaigns for Democratic candidates in the fall.¶ "He could become a liability for some Democrats sitting in red states," said Jennifer Duffy, senior editor with The Cook Political Report.

#### Midterms are referenda on the president

Cook 13 (Charlie, Political Analyst @ National Journal + Founder @ Cook Political Report, "Why Democrats Have Reason to Fear," http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/the-cook-report/why-democrats-have-reason-to-fear-20130912)

Stepping back, midterm elections are, more often than not, referenda on the White House occupant. While the president’s name is not on the ballot, voters usually register their approval or disapproval of the administration through their votes for Congress. Obama’s job-approval ratings are currently in the low- to mid-40s, roughly where George W. Bush’s were at this point in his second term (his later dropped as low as 31 percent). Obama’s disapproval ratings are running just above his approval ratings—never a good sign—but the president’s numbers are not yet radioactive.

### Obama Pop Key to Dems

#### 2014 election is a referendum on Obama – his political standing is key to midterm Senate races

Cilliza 2/2/14 (Chris, founder + editor @ The Fix + Political Commenator @ Wash Post, "2014 Senate races may be a referendum on Obama; if so, Democrats should worry," http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2014-senate-races-may-be-referendum-on-obama-if-so-democrats-should-worry/2014/02/02/f566ddac-8c1b-11e3-95dd-36ff657a4dae\_story.html)

If the 2014 election is a referendum on President Obama, Democrats are in deep trouble.¶ That’s according to a new state-by-state study of Obama’s job-approval ratings released by Gallup that puts his disapproval rating at over 50 percent in 10 of the 21 states where Democrats are defending Senate seats this fall. In many of those states,Republicans have recruited strong candidates and are preparing to spend big bucks to win the six seats they need to regain the majority.¶ Obama is deeply unpopular — with a disapproval rating higher than 55 percent — in five states: West Virginia (67.3 percent disapproval), Montana (60.9 percent), South Dakota (59.3 percent), Arkansas (57 percent) and Alaska (55.4 percent).¶ Beyond those five seats, there is a second tier of states where the president’s disapproval rating stands somewhere between 50 percent and 55 percent, including: Iowa (50.1 percent disapproval), New Hampshire (50.2 percent), North Carolina (50.4 percent), Colorado (51.2 percent) and Louisiana (53.9 percent).¶ Let’s look first at the five states where Obama’s approval rating is certain to be an issue for the Democratic candidates.¶ Three of those states have a Democratic incumbent retiring — West Virginia, Montana and South Dakota — and that fact, combined with Obama’s unpopularity, makes those seats tough holds for Democrats.¶ In Arkansas and Alaska, the Democratic incumbents are running and distancing themselves from the president as fast as they can. “Overall, I’m disappointed with the president’s State of the Union address because he was heavy on rhetoric but light on specifics about how we can move our country forward,” Sen. Mark Pryor (Ark.) said after Obama’s speech last week. Sen. Mark Begich (Alaska) offered skepticism about the president’s executive-order emphasis, disagreed with him on energy policy and said that if Obama wants to come to the Last Frontier, “I’m not really interested in campaigning” with him.¶ Democrats are putting considerable stock in the ability of people like Pryor and Begich — both of whom followed their fathers into elected office — to run on their own independent brands rather than be dragged down by the national one. They rightly point to North Dakota’s 2012 Senate race as a blueprint. In that campaign, former state attorney general Heidi Heitkamp, a known candidate with a well-regarded name, won despite the state’s clear Republican lean.¶ For his part, Begich likes to note that he won in 2008 while Obama was losing in Alaska by 22 points; the counter to that argument is that the race was wholly defined by the federal investigation surrounding then-Sen. Ted Stevens (R): The incumbent was found guilty on seven felony counts eight days before the election. There is no Stevens in this race, making it far more difficult for Begich to keep Obama (and his unpopularity) on the back burner.¶ Pryor didn’t even face a Republican opponent in 2008, but the Natural State has moved heavily against Obama and Democrats more broadly over the past six years, and Pryor is the last Democrat standing in Arkansas’s congressional delegation.¶ Of course, even if Republicans win in all five of the states where Obama is a major drag, that still leaves them a seat short of the majority. So where do they go to find that sixth seat?¶ Judging from the Obama disapproval numbers alone, Louisiana, where Sen. Mary Landrieu is running for a fourth term, and Colorado, where Sen. Mark Udall is seeking a second, represent the GOP’s best chances.¶ Landrieu has never won reelection with more than 52 percent of the vote, and because of the Pelican State’s quirky election rules, she may face a runoff against Rep. Bill Cassidy (R) in December — a contest that would immediately be turned into a national party referendum if control of the Senate were at stake.¶ Colorado, at the moment, looks like the GOP’s biggest recruiting failure in the nation, an opportunity lost unless the party can persuade a better candidate to run.¶ In two other states where Obama’s disapproval rating stands between 50 and 55 percent, Republicans have yet to coalesce behind a candidate in Iowa and continue to play a game of wait-and-see with former senator Scott Brown (R-Mass.) in New Hampshire.¶ And in North Carolina, Republicans are optimistic about state House Speaker Thom Tillis’s chances of surviving a primary and taking down Sen. Kay Hagan, although he remains very much an unproven statewide candidate.¶ Amid all of this, it’s important to remember that the Gallup numbers are from 2013 and that eight months (or so) remain before any of these Democrats will have to go before voters. It’s possible that Obama’s disapproval ratings will drop further between now and then. But even a slight comeback for the president would probably do a world of good for someone like Hagan. It’s also possible — per the Heitkamp example cited above — that people like Begich and Pryor can effectively turn the focus of their races from national concerns to state ones.¶ But, because Obama will never appear on a ballot again, the voters in these 10 states may decide they have only one way to express their displeasure with his leadership. If that happens, Democrats should be very worried.

### Turnout Key to Dems

#### Low Dem turnout seals it for Republicans

Silverleib 2013 (Alan Silverleib, CNN Political Producer, November 20, 2013, “7 Keys to the 2014 Midterms,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2013/11/20/politics/seven-keys-to-midterms/)

6. Who turns out?¶ Midterm turnout is typically lower, which translates to whiter, older, and more Republican. Core GOP constituencies are more likely to turn out at the midterm polls.¶ Take a look, for example, at the most recent two election cycles. The electorate in 2012 was 72% white, 16% age 65 or older and 53% Protestant. Forty-two percent of voters attended religious services weekly.¶ In 2010, the electorate was 77% white, 21% age 65 or older and 55% Protestant. Forty-eight percent of voters attended religious services weekly. All four of these groups vote solidly Republican.¶ If 2014 turns out to be a "typical" midterm in this respect, it will be a critical advantage for the Republicans.

#### Turnout key to the midterms - Dem turnout protects Senate control

Tomasky 14 (Michael, Columnist @ Daily Beast, "Democrats’ Best Weapon for Midterms: Fear of a Red Senate," http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/21/democrats-best-weapon-for-midterms-fear-of-a-red-senate.html)

You’ll read a lot about Obamacare and the minimum wage and the War on Women and everything else, and all those things will matter. But only one thing really, really, really matters: turnout. You know the lament: The most loyal Democratic groups—young people, black people, single women, etc.—don’t come out to vote in midterms in big numbers. You may dismiss this as lazy stereotyping, but sometimes lazy stereotyping is true, and this is one of those times.¶ So how to get these groups energized? Because if core Democratic voting groups turn out to vote in decent numbers, the Democrats will hold the Senate. Two or three of the six will hold on, the Democrats will prevail in the end in Michigan and Iowa, and either Alison Lundergan Grimes in Kentucky or Michelle Nunn in Georgia will eke out a win. Or maybe both—if Democratic voters vote. And if not? Republicans could net seven, eight.¶ The other side will be motivated: They’re older, white, angry that Obama continues to have the temerity to stand up there and be president, as if somebody elected him. This will be their last chance to push the rage button (well, the Obama-rage button; soon they’ll just start pushing the Hillary-rage button). But what will motivate the liberal side?

#### Partisan turnout key to midterms

Zelizer 3/10/14 (Julian, professor of history and public affairs at Princeton University, "Obama may hate the midterm results," http://www.cnn.com/2014/03/10/opinion/zelizer-midterm-obama/)

The problems and burdens that come from being in office, especially after an entire term of controversial decisions, never disappear. As with all midterms, partisans turn out to vote much more eagerly than moderates and independents who sit these contests out.

#### Turnout key to midterms

Malone 3/19/14 (Jim, Voice of America, "Obama’s Low Approval Hurting Democrats," http://www.voanews.com/content/obamas-low-approval-hurting-democrats/1874619.html)

Another lesson from the recent Florida race is who turned out to vote. Democrats did not get their supporters out to the polls as they had hoped while Republicans were able to do a better job of firing up their base, in large part because of opposition to Obamacare. Most experts already see a Republican advantage in this year’s midterm elections because the voter turnout in non-presidential election years tends to skew toward older white voters, a strong constituency for the Republicans. The younger, more female and more ethnically diverse electorate that helped to elect Barack Obama twice in 2008 and 2012 is not likely to show up in similar strength this year, and that has Democrats scrambling to find ways to motivate their core supporters.¶ Carroll Doherty with Pew says Democrats have a chance to be competitive in November if they can find a way to somehow cut into the Republican advantage on turnout, according to the latest research he’s seen. “What it is showing is that there is no wave election for the Republicans or the Democrats at this point. It looks pretty even, which means that the turnout is going to be a big factor and Republicans in midterms do pretty well in turnout.”

### Obama FoPo Approval High UQ

#### Polls show people still support his policies

Meyer 2014 [Dick Meyer May 16, 2014 “Public opinion on president's foreign policy is a muddle” http://www.thedenverchannel.com/decodedc/public-opinion-on-presidents-foreign-policy-is-a-muddle]

American public opinion about the country’s foreign policy is a conundrum. Polls show Americans support President Barack Obama’s policy on most every big issue, but they disapprove of his handling of foreign policy overall. They like his policies, but not his policy. They like what he’s done, but not his leadership.¶ Or maybe they just don't like the way the world is right now.

### Obama FoPo Approval Low UQ

#### Foreign policy dragging Obama approval down now

Enten 2014 [Harry Enten is a senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight. June 6, 2014 “Americans Sour on Obama’s Foreign Policy” http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/americans-sour-on-obamas-foreign-policy/]

For much of the Obama administration, the American people viewed foreign policy as one of the president’s strengths. Obama ended the unpopular war in Iraq, sought to rebuild strained foreign relations, and authorized the mission that killed Osama bin Laden. Exit polls suggest Obama’s foreign policy record helped him defeat Mitt Romney in the 2012 presidential election.¶ But over the past year and a half, the president has been bedraggled by foreign policy controversies, including his handling of the attacks in Benghazi, Libya, and their aftermath, the National Security Agency’s collection of data at home and abroad, Russia’s incursion into Ukraine, and, most recently, the prisoner swap for Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl.¶ The negative press has had an effect. Obama’s foreign policy approval rating used to run at or ahead of his overall job approval rating, but now the reverse is true. Foreign policy is a weakness for Obama. In addition, his overall job approval has lately shown signs of life; his foreign policy approval hasn’t.¶ We can see this by tracing (with a lowess regression) Obama’s overall approval rating and foreign policy approval rating over time, using polling data gathered by Huffpollster.¶ Obama’s approval rating dipped going into the 2010 midterm elections and again during the debt limit crisis in 2011. It then rose in the lead up to the 2012 presidential election and the honeymoon period afterward before dropping again throughout 2013. Only recently has it begun to recover.¶ The president’s foreign policy approval rating, meanwhile, has followed a different route. It mostly tracked with his overall approval rating during his first two years in office, but then rose above it through his re-election campaign. Most of that rise appears to have tracked with bin Laden’s death in May 2011. Since the start of 2013 though, Obama’s foreign policy approval rating has dropped precipitously. And unlike his overall approval rating, it has shown no sign of recovering. It’s now more than 5 percentage points below his overall approval rating.¶ We can also look at Obama’s net approval ratings on these measures. About 5 to 10 percent of Americans, on average, have an opinion of Obama’s overall job performance but not his foreign policy record. To account for the greater percentage of undecideds, Obama’s net approval ratings (approval minus disapproval) may be a better measure.¶ Here we get a slightly different picture but have the same conclusion. Obama’s popularity on foreign affairs consistently outperformed his overall approval rating. That was something that could only have helped Obama in Americans’ eyes.¶ But this started to change midway through 2013. For more than a year, Americans’ perceptions of Obama on foreign policy have been a drag on his popularity.¶ Correlation is not causation, but it’s hard not to conclude that the foreign policy controversies of the past year and a half have dented Obama’s appeal. If they hadn’t, we’d expect that, at worst, his foreign policy approval rating to track with his overall approval.

### FoPo Key to Election

#### Presidential foreign policy approval will swing the election

Larison 2014 [Daniel Larison January 24, 2014 The American Conservative “Foreign Policy and the 2014 Elections” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/foreign-policy-and-the-2014-elections/]

The most important effect that an Iran deal–or the failure of one–could have on the election is how it changes Obama’s approval rating, if it changes it at all. If negotiating with Iran contributes to a declining approval rating, that will also drag down the president’s party, and that will increase the number of Senate seats that the Democrats lose. Since the public has so far been mostly supportive of diplomacy with Iran, and in most polls has expressed support for the interim deal, I don’t think we should expect that to happen. In specific Senate races, having to defend the nuclear deal may be a liability for certain Democratic incumbents that already face tough challenges. It would almost certainly make things more difficult for Mark Pryor in Arkansas in his race against the extremely hawkish Tom Cotton, but he’s already on track to lose that race. There are not any competitive races this year that I can see where the nuclear deal would be an obvious boost to the Democratic candidate, but those most likely to object to the deal were already going to vote for the other party anyway.

#### Empirically it can swing close midterms

Zelizer 2014 [Julian Zelizer, CNN Contributor 6-9-2014 CNN “Will Democrats pay a price for Bergdahl deal?” http://www.cnn.com/2014/06/09/opinion/zelizer-bergdahl-democrats-midterms/]

In 1966, for instance, Republicans campaigned against Lyndon Johnson's policies in Vietnam. GOP officials such as former Vice President Richard Nixon said that Johnson was not unleashing enough force against the North Vietnamese Communists and leaving U.S. troops in a quagmire. In 1978, Republicans railed against President Jimmy Carter for his alleged weakness in foreign policy, claiming that he gave away too much in the Panama Canal Treaties and that he was pursuing a dangerous policy of détente with the Soviet Union.¶ In 1982, Democrats, who were generally focused on the recession, also spoke in favor of a nuclear freeze and warned that President Ronald Reagan's embrace of the military was bringing the nation close to war. More recently, Republicans blasted Democrats in 2002 for being weak on defense after having not supported the administration's homeland security bill. And in 2006, Democratic candidates returned the favor by criticizing the president's war in Iraq as a reckless, unnecessary and extremely costly operation that had actually undermined the war on terrorism.¶ While foreign policy carried different levels of weight in these midterms, in some of these contests, such as 1966 and 2006, the administration's actions overseas dismayed voters.

#### Its part of Republican strategy in the Midterms

Bennett 2014 [John T. Bennett 4-1-2014 Defense News “House GOP Official: Party To Make National Security a Midterm Election Issue” http://www.defensenews.com/article/20140401/DEFREG02/304010028/House-GOP-Official-Party-Make-National-Security-Midterm-Election-Issue]

An influential House Republican leadership member made clear Tuesday his party intends to inject national security and foreign policy issues into this year’s midterm elections.¶ House GOP Deputy Whip Rep. Tom Cole, R-Okla., was asked during a television appearance on MSNBC’s “Morning Joe” what issues other than Obamacare would be central to the party’s midterm election platform. He immediately pointed to national security, saying President Barack Obama’s record has left his fellow Democrats vulnerable on the issue.¶ “National security is re-emerging as an issue given, frankly, the weakness of the American response over the Ukrainian issue,” Cole said.

#### Foreign policy can swing approval ratings

Enten 2014 [Harry Enten is a senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight. June 6, 2014 “Americans Sour on Obama’s Foreign Policy” http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/americans-sour-on-obamas-foreign-policy/]

What does this mean for Obama going forward? Last year, Gallup found that the most important factor in a person approving or disapproving of Obama was how they viewed him on the economy. Over the past few months, a rise in Obama’s overall approval rating has been matched by a rise in his economic approval rating. That said, Gallup also determined that how a person views Obama on foreign policy still plays a role. Obama’s overall approval rating would probably be higher if people had the same opinion of him on foreign policy that they did a few years ago.

#### Foreign policy controversies affect presidential approval

Enten 2014 [Harry Enten is a senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight. June 6, 2014 “Americans Sour on Obama’s Foreign Policy” http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/americans-sour-on-obamas-foreign-policy/]

But over the past year and a half, the president has been bedraggled by foreign policy controversies, including his handling of the attacks in Benghazi, Libya, and their aftermath, the National Security Agency’s collection of data at home and abroad, Russia’s incursion into Ukraine, and, most recently, the prisoner swap for Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl.¶ The negative press has had an effect. Obama’s foreign policy approval rating used to run at or ahead of his overall job approval rating, but now the reverse is true. Foreign policy is a weakness for Obama. In addition, his overall job approval has lately shown signs of life; his foreign policy approval hasn’t.

#### Foreign policy will swing the Midterms- even if its not the headline issue it can have a significant effect

Rothenberg 2014 [Stuart Rothenberg April 22, 2014 Roll Call “Obama’s Foreign Policy Impacts 2014 Elections — Really” http://blogs.rollcall.com/rothenblog/how-obamas-foreign-policy-impacts-2014-elections/?dcz=]

But foreign policy could have an indirect yet significant impact on the midterm elections, making the issue more relevant than you otherwise might assume.¶ The growing perception that President Barack Obama over-promised and has under-delivered on international issues could add to the already hardening perception that his presidency has not been an unadulterated success. And that’s not good for vulnerable Democrats as the elections approach.¶ For most partisan Democrats, the suggestion that the president has failed on foreign policy is simply mistaken. They will note that he ended two wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, has taken steps to address the nuclear threat from Iran, and has tried to mobilize international opinion, and action, against military force used by Syria and Russia.¶ But even some Democrats have been critical of President Obama’s approach.¶ “…It’s been a mixed record,” said former Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta to the New York Times, “and the concern is, the president defining what America’s role in the world is in the 21st century hasn’t happened.”¶ Whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, the president’s performance on jobs and the administration’s efforts to raise the minimum wage, extend unemployment insurance and enact “equal pay” legislation, the White House’s approach to foreign policy — most recently on Syria, Ukraine, Russia and Middle East peace — has too often seemed naïve.¶ In April of 2007, during his race for the White House against Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., Obama told an audience at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, “The disappointment that so many around the world feel toward America right now is only a testament to the high expectations they hold for us. We must meet those expectations again, not because being respected is an end in itself, but because the security of America and the wider world demands it.”¶ Almost two years after that Chicago speech and a little more than two months into his presidency, Americans did believe that the new president had improved the United States’ image abroad. But those numbers have slipped noticeably since then.¶ In February of 2009, according to the Gallup Poll, more than two out of three Americans surveyed (67 percent) said that “leaders of other countries around the world have respect for Barack Obama.” One year later, only 56 perfect answered the same way, and a year after that a bare majority, 51 percent, said that the president was respected by other countries’ leaders.¶ That figure remained virtually unchanged in polling conducted in early 2012 and 2013, but this year, Gallup found only 41 percent of Americans believing that Obama was respected by leaders of other countries, while 53 percent said that those leaders “don’t have much respect” for Obama.¶ “Democrats and independents are mainly responsible for the slide in Obama’s ratings,” concluded Gallup’s Jeffrey M. Jones in a Feb. 24 post on the company’s website.¶ Obama’s poll numbers are still better than George W. Bush’s throughout most of his presidency, and Gallup found that even now, a narrow majority of Americans believe the United States rates favorably “in the eyes of the world.”¶ But the president’s declining job performance numbers on foreign policy in NBC News/Wall Street Journal surveys over the past few years is impossible to ignore. (See question No. 6 in the March 5-9 survey, here. It includes historical data.)¶ In May 2011, Obama’s net job approval as president was +11, while his job approval on handling the economy was a -21. But on his handling of foreign policy, the president’s job performance was a stunning +22 (57 percent approve/35 percent disapprove).¶ One year later, Obama’s net job approval was +2, while his job approval on his handling of the economy was -9. Once again, his job rating on foreign policy was measurably higher than both, with a net of +9 (51 percent approve/42 percent disapprove).¶ The same trend held in December of 2012 and April of 2013 NBC News/Wall Street Journal polls, though the differences in Obama’s net job approval on his overall performance, the economy and foreign policy were narrowing.¶ This March, the president’s performance in all three areas was almost identical. In fact, an identical 41 percent of respondents approved of his performance in his overall job, his handling of the economy and his handling of foreign policy.¶ Obama’s net approval as president was -13, while his net approval in handling the economy was -15 and his handling of foreign policy was -12 (41 percent approve/53 percent disapprove).¶ Are voters increasingly unhappy with the president’s foreign policy actions, or is the public’s general dissatisfaction with Obama’s performance poisoning their view of his foreign policy performance?¶ It doesn’t really matter.¶ Public dissatisfaction with the president’s handling of foreign policy is another problem for Democrats who need to generate a strong base turnout and also convince swing voters that the president and his party deserve their support in November.¶ The less happy voters (particularly Democrats and Independents) are about the Obama presidency, the more difficult it will be for Democratic strategists to achieve the results they want in the midterm elections.

### FoPo Not Relevant to Midterms

#### Foreign policy wont affect the midterms

Larison 2014 [Daniel Larison January 24, 2014 The American Conservative “Foreign Policy and the 2014 Elections” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/foreign-policy-and-the-2014-elections/]

All of this makes sense, but it seems more likely that the midterms won’t be significantly influenced by international events and foreign policy either way. Barring a new attack on the U.S. or Americans overseas or the eruption of a major conflict somewhere in the world, foreign policy will matter even less to most midterm voters than it did to voters in the 2012 election. There have obviously been midterm elections in the recent past where national security and foreign policy issues were top priorities for many voters (e.g., 2002 and 2006), and they did contribute to the success or failure of the president’s party, but those elections took place in the wake of 9/11 and during the worst year (at least for the U.S.) of the Iraq war. So far, there is nothing like either of these that will influence the midterms. As unpopular as the war in Afghanistan is, it doesn’t appear to be a major factor driving Republican gains this year.

### FoPo Focus= Dem Loss

#### Even if its not a central issue it destroys Democrats

Zelizer 2014 [Julian Zelizer, CNN Contributor 6-9-2014 CNN “Will Democrats pay a price for Bergdahl deal?” http://www.cnn.com/2014/06/09/opinion/zelizer-bergdahl-democrats-midterms/]

Will foreign policy play a factor in the 2014 midterms? It is unlikely that it will be a major issue but there are ways it could have an indirect effect on the ballot box and cause trouble for Democrats when Americans turn out to vote.¶ At the most immediate level, the foreign policy controversy has already distracted the news media from other kinds of stories upon which congressional Democrats were hoping to focus. The foreign policy controversy intensified just as there was evidence that the economy was picking up steam and that the Obama's health care program was gaining strength. Both signs of accomplishment were put on the back burner, overshadowed by the Bergdahl debate.¶ The stories also feed the perception of some voters who feel that Democrats have not done a good job managing government. This is a White House that once prided itself on competence. Obama, a well-educated politician who surrounded himself with bright staff, vowed to avoid the kind of mismanagement that had been on display with Hurricane Katrina during President George W. Bush's term. But that reputation has slowly been undercut, especially after the botched health care website rollout and the VA scandal.

#### Contributes to perceptions of Democratic weakness and lack of resolve

Zelizer 2014 [Julian Zelizer, CNN Contributor 6-9-2014 CNN “Will Democrats pay a price for Bergdahl deal?” http://www.cnn.com/2014/06/09/opinion/zelizer-bergdahl-democrats-midterms/]

The foreign policy debate puts into focus the argument that Obama, as well as the party he leads, lacks a bold vision. This is something that has even frustrated many Democrats who feel that the President is too much of pragmatist and not enough of a visionary. The speech at West Point fell flat for some Americans because it almost seemed focus on excusing what he couldn't do rather outlining what he wants to do.

#### Foreign policy also rallies the Republican base

Zelizer 2014 [Julian Zelizer, CNN Contributor 6-9-2014 CNN “Will Democrats pay a price for Bergdahl deal?” http://www.cnn.com/2014/06/09/opinion/zelizer-bergdahl-democrats-midterms/]

The debate over foreign policy helps Republicans by riling up the party's base at an opportune time, five months before the election, while at the same time dispiriting the Democrats. Yes, voters are thinking primarily about how they're faring in today's economy, but on the margins, their perception of their local candidate's views on foreign policy could be a factor in November.

# Impacts

## Dems Good

### Dems Good- Iran Deal Internal Link Ext

#### Republican win ensures latitude to negotiate is gone

Larison 2014 [Daniel Larison January 24, 2014 The American Conservative “Foreign Policy and the 2014 Elections” http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/foreign-policy-and-the-2014-elections/]

We should also bear in mind that the midterms could have an unfortunate effect on diplomacy with Iran. Since the Republicans are likely to take control of the Senate, that could factor into the calculations of other states when they consider Obama’s ability to follow through on U.S. diplomatic commitments. If the Iranians assume that a Republican-controlled Senate would press ahead with additional sanctions legislation or perhaps even an authorization of force resolution, they may conclude that reaching a deal with the U.S. before the election is a mistake. Needless to say, the U.S. will have less flexibility to offer additional sanctions relief in the future once the Senate is under GOP control, and that could affect negotiations this year for the worse.

### Iran Deal Solves Prolif

#### Iran deal solves Iran prolif- interim deal sets the stage for future agreements

Economist 11-30 [Economist 11-30-2013 “Well begun, not nearly done” http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21590959-encouraging-interim-deal-iran-makes-permanent-check-its-nuclear-ambitions-easier]

THE interim deal concluded on November 24th between six world powers and Iran is much better than its many critics allow. In return for six months of “limited, temporary…and reversible” relief from some international sanctions, Iran has said it will not just freeze its progress towards a possible nuclear bomb, but actually take a few steps back. This, too, is limited, temporary and reversible; nothing is being decommissioned, and six months is a short time. But if further negotiations can cement the gains in place, they would mark a turning point in efforts to stop nuclear proliferation—and perhaps in regional politics more broadly (see article).¶ The agreement was brought about by a multilateral process in Geneva and secret parallel discussions between the Obama administration and Iran which began in August, when Iran’s new president, Hassan Rohani, took office. Both sets of negotiations were conducted in an atmosphere of constructive endeavour, a far cry from the sterile declarations and mutual suspicion of the past.¶ A nuclear-weapons programme needs either uranium which has been highly enriched—something achieved by passing the stuff repeatedly through cascades of whirling centrifuges—or plutonium. At present the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reckons that Iran has almost 200kg of 20%-enriched uranium in a form that could easily be enriched up to the 90% or so needed for a bomb. Under the terms of the deal (see table on next page) Iran will get rid of this stock, either by putting it in a form that is hard to enrich further or by mixing it with unenriched uranium, thus diluting it to less than 5%. At the same time it will freeze its enrichment capabilities at their current capacity, undertake no further enrichment beyond the 5% level, and do nothing to increase the 7,200kg stockpile of low-enriched uranium that is currently in a form that can easily be further enriched.¶ Mark Fitzpatrick of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, a think-tank in London, believes that the effect of the deal is to double the “breakout time” it would take Iran to produce enough material for a few nuclear weapons. Before the deal this was estimated at perhaps six weeks, and was steadily shortening.¶ The deal addresses the other possible route to the bomb by stopping most work on a reactor at Arak which was to have been ready for commissioning late next year. The Arak reactor is of a design particularly well suited to producing plutonium, and needs no enriched uranium in order to do so. Once the reactor is fuelled up, any attack on it would release a plume of radioactivity; this makes its commissioning something of a point of no return as far as military action against Iran is concerned. The deal also stops all work on facilities that might be used to extract plutonium from its spent fuel. These constraints are in large measure thanks to the French, whose objections to insufficient action on Arak prevented an agreement from being reached two weeks earlier.¶ Iran has also said it will co-operate with a far more intrusive inspection regime; this makes the deal very different from the one reached with North Korea in 2005, which the Koreans then broke. Iran has promised to answer all the questions posed by the IAEA about what the agency refers to as the “possible military dimensions” of its nuclear programme. It will provide access to nuclear sites hitherto off-limits, possibly including the Parchin military base where Western intelligence agencies think it tested a detonation system for a bomb.

#### Iran deal solves prolif- best available option

Conca 11/30 [James Conca scientist in the field of the earth and environmental sciences for 31 years, specializing in geologic disposal of nuclear waste, energy-related research, subsurface transport and environmental clean-up of heavy metals Director of the New Mexico State University Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center, the independent and academic monitoring facility for the Department of Energy's WIPP site, a little-known deep geologic nuclear repository for bomb waste. I came to NMSU from Los Alamos National Laboratory where I was Project Leader for Radionuclide Geochemistry and its input into the Yucca Mt Project. Before that, I was on the faculty at Washington State University Tri-Cities. At the California Institute of Technology, I obtained a Ph.D. in Geochemistry in 1985 and a Masters in Planetary Science in 1981. I received a Bachelor's in Science in Geology/Biology from Brown University in 1979 11/30/2013 “The Iranian Nuclear Deal Is A Good One” Forbes http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/11/30/the-iranian-nuclear-deal-is-a-good-one/]

This Thanksgiving had an extra reason to be thankful – the new deal between Iran and six superpowers. Last week, the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China (the P5+1 group) reached an interim deal with Iran to stop their nuclear weapons program. Four key provisions were obtained in this deal:¶ 1) no enrichment of U above 5% U-235, and all highly-enriched materials, some as high as 20% U-235, must be blended down to less than 5% or altered to a form not usable for weapons.¶ 2) no additional centrifuges are to be installed or produced, and three-fourths of the centrifuges at Fordow and half of the centrifuges at Natanz will be inoperable,¶ 3) stop all work on the heavy-water reactor at Arak, provide design details on the reactor (which could be used to produce Pu for the other type of atomic weapon) and do not develop the reprocessing facilities needed to separate Pu from used fuel,¶ 4) full access by IAEA inspectors to all nuclear facilities, including daily visitation to Natanz and Fordow, and continuous camera surveillance of key sites.¶ Despite all the rhetoric of horror and claims that this deal is a mistake, this deal is just what we all hoped for as the first step to resolving the Iranian nuclear weapons issue, the structure of which we’ve been proposing for years. It is the first step to bringing Iran into the world’s nuclear community as a partner instead of an adversary, making Iran a compliant signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. While this may make some of its neighbors nervous, there is no real alternative that does not involve lots of destruction and death.

### A2: Sanctions Solve Prolif

#### Sanctions will fail without option of negotiation- you can’t just collapse their government with them

Conca 11/30 [James Conca scientist in the field of the earth and environmental sciences for 31 years, specializing in geologic disposal of nuclear waste, energy-related research, subsurface transport and environmental clean-up of heavy metals Director of the New Mexico State University Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center, the independent and academic monitoring facility for the Department of Energy's WIPP site, a little-known deep geologic nuclear repository for bomb waste. I came to NMSU from Los Alamos National Laboratory where I was Project Leader for Radionuclide Geochemistry and its input into the Yucca Mt Project. Before that, I was on the faculty at Washington State University Tri-Cities. At the California Institute of Technology, I obtained a Ph.D. in Geochemistry in 1985 and a Masters in Planetary Science in 1981. I received a Bachelor's in Science in Geology/Biology from Brown University in 1979 11/30/2013 “The Iranian Nuclear Deal Is A Good One” Forbes http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/11/30/the-iranian-nuclear-deal-is-a-good-one/]

I’m not sure what the naysayers of this deal think the sanctions were suppose to do. The purpose of sanctions is to get a specific party to the negotiating table. Sanctions are not meant to destroy a nation, cause widespread poverty of its people and destruction of their economy, or topple governments. The fear of these happening, not the reality of them, is what gets a government to the table.

### A2: Sanctions Solve Negotiations

#### This defies all logic and pscyhology

Pillar 1-2 [Paul R. Pillar is Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Center for Security Studies at Georgetown University and Nonresident Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution. He is a contributing editor to The National Interest 1-2-2014 “Let's Be Honest on Iran” http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/lets-be-honest-iran-9658]

The promoters of the legislation contend that its effect would be just the opposite, and would increase U.S. bargaining power and make it more likely Iran would make concessions we want. It is possible that some members of Congress who might be inclined to vote for this bill, and even some who have signed on as co-sponsors, actually believe that contention. They keep hearing, after all, the trope about how “sanctions brought Iran to the table” and that if some sanctions are a good thing than even more sanctions are an even better thing. But anyone who has thought seriously for more than a minute about this subject—as the chief promoters of the legislation surely have—realizes how fallacious that idea is. Whatever role sanctions may have had in getting Iran to the table, it is the prospect of getting sanctions removed, not having them forever increase, that will induce Iran, now that it is at the table, to complete an agreement placing severe restrictions on its nuclear program. It goes against all logic and psychology to think that right after Iran has made most of the concessions necessary to conclude the preliminary Joint Plan of Action, “rewarding” it with more pressure and more punishment would put Iranians in the mood to make still more concessions.¶ The people doing the negotiating for the United States oppose the legislation because of the damage it would do to the negotiations. Their view is highly significant, no matter how much one might agree or disagree with whatever specific terms the administration is trying to get. If the legislation really would strengthen the U.S. negotiating position, any U.S. negotiator would welcome it.

#### They only embolden hardliners more in Iran

Pillar 1-2 [Paul R. Pillar is Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Center for Security Studies at Georgetown University and Nonresident Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution. He is a contributing editor to The National Interest 1-2-2014 “Let's Be Honest on Iran” http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/lets-be-honest-iran-9658]

And if that weren't enough, counterparts to Kirk and Menendez in the Iranian legislature are providing further evidence of the destructive effect of what is transpiring on Capitol Hill, with the Iranian legislators' bill calling for Iran to start enriching uranium to a level well beyond what it has ever done before if the United States imposes any new sanctions. This is direct confirmation of how threats and hardline obstinacy, especially at this juncture, beget threats and hardline obstinacy from the other side. The Iranian bill also provides a real-life opportunity for some role reversal. Does this threat emanating from the majlis make U.S. policy-makers more inclined to take a softer line and make more concessions? Of course not.

#### New sanctions collapse Iran negotiations

Slavin 12-5 [Barbara Slavin is a senior fellow at the Atlantic Council’s South Asia Center and a correspondent for Al-Monitor.com, a website specializing in the Middle East. She is the author of a 2007 book, Bitter Friends, Bosom Enemies: Iran, the US and the Twisted Path to Confrontation, and is a regular commentator on U.S. foreign policy and Iran on NPR, PBS, C-SPAN and the Voice of America 12-5-2013 Voice of America News “Column: Iran Deal Won't Be a North Korea Report” http://www.voanews.com/content/barbara-slavin-iran-deal-wont-be-a-repeat-of-north-korea/1804245.html]

To the extent that the comparisons between the North Korea and Iran cases have merit, it mostly has to do with Congress. A Republican-led House of Representatives was repeatedly late in appropriating money in the mid-late 1990s to pay for the fuel oil shipments to North Korea. The U.S. and its partners also lagged in constructing two light-water nuclear reactors that were supposed to replace the more proliferation-prone facility at Yongbyon. “The implementation was messed up,” said Joel Wit, a former U.S. official dealing with North Korea.¶ ¶ Congress could now try to blow up the Geneva agreement with Iran by imposing new sanctions, which would violate the accords. The Obama administration is trying to convince Congress to hold off on any new sanctions, at least until the interim agreement runs its course in six months.

#### Sanctions derail the deal- ensures Iran can’t get it through

Milani 11-14 [Abbas Milani is a contributing editor at The New Republic, the director of Iranian Studies at Stanford University, and the author, most recently, of The Shah. 11-14-2013 “Two Reasons Why Iran Resumed Nuclear Negotiations” The New Republic http://www.newrepublic.com/article/115594/iran-nuclear-negotiations-us-resumed-two-reasons]

The second important fact to consider is the cost of this break-out capacity. With the increasing bite of sanctions, and with eight years of utter corruption and incompetence during President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's tenure, the Islamic regime has suddenly faced the reality that their long-sought break-out capacity has been bought at an exorbitantly high price. With oil revenues drying up, and increasing competition among factions within the regime for a bigger share of the shrinking pie, Iran urgently needed an agreement to end the sanctions. Those who oppose any deal with the regime believe that not only making no deal at this time, but increasing sanctions, will either bring about the collapse of the regime or convince it to roll back its nuclear program. That argument, however, overlooks a critical point: The regime, particularly Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and his allies, are surely inept but not suicidal. They have spent so much political and economic capital on achieving the break-out capacity that any agreement they could not sell to the Iranian people as a victory—or, in their new language, a "win-win"—would be tantamount to political suicide for them. It is thus as much folly to think that the regime will, in desperation, accept any deal—including one that requires a complete dismantlement of their enrichment program—as it is to think that any deal they offer is worth making.

### A2: Lifting Sanctions Floods Oil Market

#### Nope supply is down anyways

Eshbaugh 12-10 [Mark J. Eshbaugh works for the EIA 12-10-2013 “Iran’s oil exports not expected to increase significantly despite recent negotiations” Energy Information Administration http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=14111]

The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) does not anticipate an immediate impact on global liquid fuels supply following the November 24 announcement of a Joint Plan of Action (JPA) between Iran and the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (the United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia, and China) plus Germany (P5+1) on Iran's nuclear program. The JPA does not directly allow for additional Iranian oil sales, although it does suspend sanctions on associated insurance and transportation services to those countries already granted import waivers.¶ The imposition of sanctions on associated insurance and transportation services by the European Union (E.U.) had a significant effect on Iran's exports when implemented in July 2012, but Iran has been able to create arrangements that allow it to export limited quantities of oil to several countries. EIA does not anticipate those countries significantly increasing their oil imports from Iran, so without an easing of sanctions covering Iran's ability to sell additional oil, the country is unlikely to significantly increase its production or exports in the short term.¶ Iran's total liquids production and exports declined significantly as a result of sanctions imposed on its energy sector, and the recent JPA is not expected to significantly impact the existing sanctions regime for at least the next six months, according to official U.S. Department of State statements. EIA estimates Iranian crude oil production was 2.8 million barrels per day (bbl/d) in November 2013, down from an annual average of 3.7 million bbl/d in 2011 and 3 million bbl/d in 2012. Crude oil exports averaged just 1.1 million bbl/d over the first nine months of 2013, down from 2.5 million bbl/d in 2011 and 1.5 million bbl/d in 2012, according to the International Energy Agency.

### A2: Saudi Prolif Turns

#### They will eventually support the deal- they can’t prolif now because of internal constraints

Upol 12-2 [Arafat Kabir Upol is an observer of national and global politics, foreign policy and diplomacy. A native from Bangladesh, his works have appeared in the Diplomatic Courier, International Policy Digest, the Diplomat and other publications. He is a multilingual member of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy. 12-2-2013 “Why Reports of Saudi Arabia’s Nuclear Ambitions are a Fantasy” http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2013/12/02/reports-saudi-arabias-nuclear-ambitions-fantasy/]

Apart from that, Saudi Arabia’s self-assumed status as the leader of the Islamic world would be put in jeopardy. According to Thomas Lippman, the now-deceased, Crown Prince Sultan bin Abdul Aziz, declared that nuclear weapons ran counter to the tenets of Islam. Saudi Arabia’s pursuit of nuclear weapons would deepen anti-Saudi Arabia sentiment in the Muslim world. Attainment of nuclear weapons would afford national pride for Saudi Arabia, but at the cost of its status in the Muslim world.¶ Overcome with concerns over an Iranian nuclear weapons program, Saudi Arabia’s pursuit of nuclear weapons, if true, would be an important strategic victory for Iran. Iranians will regard this as a tacit sanction of their nuclear weapons program. Saudi bombs, according to Mr. Kile, “would almost certainly lead Israel to increase the size of its undeclared nuclear arsenal and would lead to calls inside Iran for it to build a nuclear weapon.” However, rhetoric aside, Saudi Arabia is astute enough not to let the Middle East tinderbox ignite. For this reason, they are expected to work in concert with Washington to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

#### Iran prolif is more proximate cause for Saudi prolif- they would only do it if Iran actually got the bomb

Upol 12-2 [Arafat Kabir Upol is an observer of national and global politics, foreign policy and diplomacy. A native from Bangladesh, his works have appeared in the Diplomatic Courier, International Policy Digest, the Diplomat and other publications. He is a multilingual member of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy. 12-2-2013 “Why Reports of Saudi Arabia’s Nuclear Ambitions are a Fantasy” http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2013/12/02/reports-saudi-arabias-nuclear-ambitions-fantasy/]

Since Saudi Arabia’s desire to attain nuclear weapons is not without precedent (the Guardian put forward a similar claim in 2003) analysts could not entirely discount the possibility of Saudi Arabian nuclear proliferation. A nuclear-armed Iran concerns Saudi Arabia and the region, and thus, if Iran develops nuclear weapons other countries will follow suit. “All options are available,” said Mohammed bin Nawaf bin Abdul Aziz, Saudi Arabia’s ambassador to the United Kingdom, regarding preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. Nevertheless, there are a number of compelling reasons to believe why the story behind Saudi Arabia’s nuclear ambitions is fantasy.¶ BBC Newsnight’s Defense Editor, Mark Urban, referenced his principal source, an anonymous Western official. Surprisingly, he concluded that Saudi Arabia would be able to acquire nuclear weapons sooner than Iran. “Saudi Arabia has invested in Pakistani nuclear weapons projects, and believes it could obtain atomic bombs at will, a variety of sources have told BBC Newsnight,” writes the BBC’s Mark Urban. Seemingly, Urban connected the dots between Saudi Arabia’s generous investment in Pakistan’s nuclear program and Saudi Arabian acquisition of Pakistani nuclear technology. Harvard Professor Matthew Bunn cautiously labeled Saudi-Pakistani nuclear cooperation a “plausible theory” given that there is hardly any solid evidence vis-à-vis the Saudi Arabian nuclear program for a military purpose. Shannon Kile with the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute acknowledged the “lack of authoritative or publicly available evidence.”¶ One of the sources behind this could have been veteran U.S. diplomat Dennis Ross’s confirmation that in a meeting in April, 2009 Saudi Arabia’s King Abdullah reiterated his intentions to obtain nuclear weapons if Iran gets their own. “Since 2009, when King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia warned visiting US special envoy to the Middle East Dennis Ross that if Iran crossed the threshold, ‘we will get nuclear weapons,’ the kingdom has sent the Americans numerous signals of its intentions,” Urban reports.¶ The failure of the UN Security Council to make the Middle East a nuclear free zone is one of the reasons that Saudi Arabia rejected a seat on the council. However, Saudi Arabia must take into account the risks of developing their own weapons program. Saudi Arabia must understand that by developing their own program this will only encourage Iran to fast track their own program and it will undoubtedly trigger a nuclear arm race with Israel and may tempt Turkey to follow suit soon after. “The thought of a multinuclear Middle East is a nightmare scenario that no one, I believe, knows how to handle,” said Charles Freilich, the former deputy National Security Adviser of Israel.¶

#### No Pakistan sale to Saudi Arabia

Upol 12-2 [Arafat Kabir Upol is an observer of national and global politics, foreign policy and diplomacy. A native from Bangladesh, his works have appeared in the Diplomatic Courier, International Policy Digest, the Diplomat and other publications. He is a multilingual member of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy. 12-2-2013 “Why Reports of Saudi Arabia’s Nuclear Ambitions are a Fantasy” http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2013/12/02/reports-saudi-arabias-nuclear-ambitions-fantasy/]

While the BBC’s Mark Urban would like to argue that this is the case, Pakistan is not prepared to hand over nuclear weapons to Saudi Arabia in order to deter Iran. Should Pakistan decide to either help the Saudis develop their own nuclear program or transport a limited amount of their stockpile to Saudi Arabia, Pakistan would have to deal with the repercussions that would soon follow.¶ First, despite being a non-signatory nation to the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty), Pakistan would face sweeping sanctions in the process. Pakistan’s economy is already languishing. Therefore, Pakistan may not be able to withstand further economic constraints. Punitive measures from the United States alone could rupture Pakistan’s economy as U.S. aid is estimated to cover 6.5 percent of its annual budget. Floods of Saudi cash could offset this effect for a short period of time. “If the United States used its leverage at the World Bank or International Monetary Fund to attenuate the support of those institutions, Pakistan would be thrown into a major fiscal crisis,” suggested Christopher Clary and Mara E. Karlin.¶ Second, Pakistan shares a land border with Iran, but it does not consider Iran a threat. Pakistan’s nuclear strategy has never been Iran-centric instead it has chosen to focus its attention on India. Historically, Pakistan has enjoyed a semi-functional relationship with Iran. An ambitious tri-nation gas pipeline project has been under consideration in Islamabad after India refrained from advancing it due to U.S. pressure.¶ Finally, Pakistan’s ability to project its security umbrella over Saudi Arabia while maintaining its own is not a certainty. The country is estimated to only possess over a hundred nuclear warheads. Pakistan’s principal rival India has clearly surpassed Pakistan in developing conventional weaponry. That said; it is not certain how Pakistan will maintain its deterrence against India if it gives a portion of its nuclear stockpile to Saudi Arabia.

#### International law would prevent Saudi Arabia from developing a weapon first

Upol 12-2 [Arafat Kabir Upol is an observer of national and global politics, foreign policy and diplomacy. A native from Bangladesh, his works have appeared in the Diplomatic Courier, International Policy Digest, the Diplomat and other publications. He is a multilingual member of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy. 12-2-2013 “Why Reports of Saudi Arabia’s Nuclear Ambitions are a Fantasy” http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2013/12/02/reports-saudi-arabias-nuclear-ambitions-fantasy/]

As a party to the NPT Saudi Arabia must abide by international law. Collapsing the highly respected NPT portends a bleak future for international law, as many nations will attempt to become nuclear-armed by taking the same path as Saudi Arabia. In this regard, the West might target Saudi Arabia with sanctions. Because of that, if the global community somehow manages to impose energy sanctions on Saudi Arabia this would paralyze Saudi Arabia’s economy. Unlike Iran’s, the Saudi economy is less self-sufficient. Contributing 90 percent of the export earnings, the petroleum sector is the foundation of Saudi Arabia’s economy. Saudi Arabia’s enormous oil reserve makes the Kingdom vulnerable to potential sanctions.

### A2: Deal Causes Iran Strikes

#### It actually pushes them farther from their red line

Cirincione 11-25 [Joseph Cirincione is president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and a member of Secretary of State John Kerry's International Security Advisory Board and the Council on Foreign Relations. He's also the author of "Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons." Interviewed by Ezra Klein 11-25-2013 “‘If you don’t like negotiating with Iran what you’re really saying is you want to go to war’” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/25/if-you-dont-like-negotiating-with-iran-what-youre-really-saying-is-you-want-to-go-to-war/]

This addresses the major threat that Prime Minister Netanyahu warned the world about in September 2012. He went to the dais of the U.N. General Assembly and he held up a cartoon drawing of a bomb and drew a red line across the top. He warned the world that Iran would soon have enough uranium enriched to 20 percent and that they could quickly, in weeks or months, make a bomb.¶ His concerns were well-founded. Iran now has about 190 kilograms of this enriched uranium. If they got to 240 kilograms, they'd be very close to a bomb. This deal drains the uranium from Mr. Netanyahu’s bomb. It drains the amount of 20 percent enriched uranium [Iran has]. It makes it much less likely Iran could break out and make a bomb. And it goes further: It stops the manufacturing of new centrifuges. It changes the inspection regime from weekly to daily. If Iran wanted to do anything suspicious, there’s a high probability we'd know about it and could act instantly to stop them.¶ EK: What’s the counterfactual here? Imagine this deal wasn’t struck and things simply kept on trend. Where would this issue be going?¶ JC: If Iran hadn’t paused, in a matter of months they would cross Israel’s red line. In perhaps a year they could’ve constructed a crude nuclear device. In another year, they could construct a warhead to put on a missile. While we might think we had two years or so to act, Israel doesn’t look at it that way. They wanted to kill the nuclear baby in the crib. So the alternative to this deal was war. We shouldn’t kid ourselves. There’s no sanction regime known to man that’s been able to coerce a country into compliance. So if you don't like negotiating with Iran, what you're really saying is you want to go to war. We should be clear-eyed about this. We shouldn’t think there’s some better deal out there.

#### No Israel Strike now

Cirincione 11-25 [Joseph Cirincione is president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and a member of Secretary of State John Kerry's International Security Advisory Board and the Council on Foreign Relations. He's also the author of "Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons." Interviewed by Ezra Klein 11-25-2013 “‘If you don’t like negotiating with Iran what you’re really saying is you want to go to war’” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/25/if-you-dont-like-negotiating-with-iran-what-youre-really-saying-is-you-want-to-go-to-war/]

EK: One argument that Jeffrey Goldberg makes is that another objective of this deal was stopping Israel from making any sudden moves. Now that there’s a deal in place, Israel can’t simply blow up the international community’s negotiations and launch an attack. Do you agree?¶ JC: I think it’s almost impossible for Israel to launch a military strike on Iran right now. They're isolated. The prime minister is issuing some very tough statements but as far as I can see, he’s the only world leader issuing them. Even Saudi Arabia, which has serious qualms about the deal, is issuing positive statements at the start.

### A2: Interim Deal Enough

#### Interim deal is not enough by itself- need further negotiations

Kaylan 11-25 [Melik Kaylan has written about ancient places, warzones, political upheavals and far frontiers for the Wall Street Journal and Newsweek since the 1990s. That covers an area from the China-North Korea border to the Caucasus, to Iraq, Iran, Syria, Turkey to Eastern Europe. Submerging markets. 11-25-2013 Forbes “Is The Iran Deal Good Or Bad?” http://www.forbes.com/sites/melikkaylan/2013/11/25/is-the-iran-deal-good-or-bad/]

Here’s the most self-evident truth about the Sunday deal in Geneva on Iran’s nuclear program: don’t trust anyone who has a stridently categorical view on the matter. The sanest observers have correctly argued that it constitutes a first step on a long, hard road and that includes Messrs Obama and Kerry. When you consider that six months of secret negotiations led to this most interim of stages, you get the picture. The deal does halt Iran dash to ‘breakout’ capacity but doesn’t yet prevent the mullahs, should negotiations fail, from restarting the process of enriching uranium to weaponization or producing plutonium for that purpose at a new reactor still in development. We are talking about a pause.

### A2: Iran No Pass Future Deal

#### Bilateral talks are making progress towards a final deal

Xinhua 6-12 [Xinhua 6-12-2014 “Iran in constructive talks with powers in bid to narrow gaps” http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2014-06/12/c\_133402581.htm]

TEHRAN, June 12 (Xinhua) -- The talks between the representatives of Iran and Russia over Iran's nuclear program were fruitful, Pess TV reported on Thursday quoting a senior Iranian nuclear negotiator.¶ During the talks, both sides discussed the issues raised in the previous rounds of nuclear negotiations and held consultations, Abbas Araqchi, also Iran's deputy foreign minister for legal and international affairs, said on Wednesday after Iran's nuclear negotiating team and the Russian representatives met in Rome.¶ He also described as "helpful" the bilateral talks between negotiators from the Islamic republic and France in the Swiss city of Geneva on Wednesday.¶ The talks between Iranian and French officials were held in a " positive atmosphere," and the meeting was "helpful" ahead of the next round of high-level negotiations over Tehran's nuclear program.¶ Iran and the U.S. officials had tense discussions and exchanged views on the topics pertaining to Iran's nuclear issue but differences still endured, Araqchi told media after two-day direct nuclear talks between Iran and the United States ended in Geneva on Tuesday.¶ Iran has started to hold bilateral talks with the members of the P5+1 group -- Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States, plus Germany -- to narrow down the gaps between the sides ahead of the new round of negotiations.¶ Iran's Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Marzieh Afkham on Wednesday said the purpose of the talks is to make much of the time before the upcoming high-level negotiations between Iran and the P5+1 group.

#### Bilateral talks will produce an agreement for Congress to sign

Bayati 6-12 [Abdol Hamid Bayati 6-12-2014 Tehran Times “Iran-U.S. bilateral nuclear talks a good sign: Fitzpatrick” http://www.tehrantimes.com/component/content/article/93-interviews/116226-iran-us-bilateral-nuclear-talks-a-good-sign-fitzpatrick]

Mark Fitzpatrick, director for non-proliferation and disarmament at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London, says it is a “good sign” that Iran and the United States held bilateral talks on Tehran’s nuclear issue.¶ ¶ Senior negotiators from Iran and the U.S. held direct nuclear talks on Monday and Tuesday in Geneva. The Iranian team was led by Abbas Araqchi, the deputy foreign minister for legal and international affair. The U.S. delegation was headed by Deputy Secretary of State William Burns. Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, the primary U.S. negotiator with Iran, was also on the U.S. team.¶ ¶ “The fact that U.S. and Iranian diplomats are meeting bilaterally in Geneva is a good sign,” Fitzpatrick said. “It demonstrates their seriousness in trying to reach an agreement by the 20 July deadline.”¶ ¶ He added, “By talking quietly in a bilateral setting, the U.S. and Iranian negotiators hope they can find some way around the impasse.”¶ ¶ Fitzpatrick believes that the interim nuclear deal signed between Iran and the six major powers (the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany, known as the 5+1 group) in November was the “result of direct talks” between the Iranian and U.S. negotiators.¶ ¶ “The Joint Plan of Action that was reached last November came about as the result of direct talks between the United States and Iran,” he noted. “Let us hope that direct bilateral talks can again produce a solution.”

#### Iran has to make a future deal- there is too much oil they are giving up if not

Cirincione 11-25 [Joseph Cirincione is president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and a member of Secretary of State John Kerry's International Security Advisory Board and the Council on Foreign Relations. He's also the author of "Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons." Interviewed by Ezra Klein 11-25-2013 “‘If you don’t like negotiating with Iran what you’re really saying is you want to go to war’” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/25/if-you-dont-like-negotiating-with-iran-what-youre-really-saying-is-you-want-to-go-to-war/]

JC: This deal doubles Iran’s breakout time to a nuclear weapon and makes it much more likely that we would see them doing it. It also freezes the program in place. And while we're watching them they can't substantially enhance their capabilities. So we don't lose anything in this deal. And all we’ve given up is a small amount of Iran’s money that we had frozen. The estimates are that they'll receive $7-$10 billion in relief. But they have more than $100 billion still frozen abroad. And all the sanctions on their oil trade and their financial system and their banking still apply. If Iran wants to get back to selling two million barrels of oil a day, they need to finish the final deal and satisfy us that they're giving up their weapon options here.

#### Iran can’t back out on these negotiations

Kaylan 11-25 [Melik Kaylan has written about ancient places, warzones, political upheavals and far frontiers for the Wall Street Journal and Newsweek since the 1990s. That covers an area from the China-North Korea border to the Caucasus, to Iraq, Iran, Syria, Turkey to Eastern Europe. Submerging markets. 11-25-2013 Forbes “Is The Iran Deal Good Or Bad?” http://www.forbes.com/sites/melikkaylan/2013/11/25/is-the-iran-deal-good-or-bad/]

Other pressures forced Tehran’s hand. If you do a quick tour d’horizon you can instantly grasp Tehran’s predicament. Iran has become totally dependent on Chinese trade and Russian weapons procurement. One can imagine what that does to its Islamic bona fides within and outside the country. Meanwhile, as the economy shrinks, more and more resources go towards inflated Russo-Chinese prices on everything from spare parts for rockets to buying back oil outsourced for refining. On the current trajectory the regime’s chances of surviving the next decade must have looked grim, especially if you cost in the expenses of projecting power over Iraq, Syria and Hezbollah. Sanctions worked. The mullahs had nowhere else to turn. Looking north to the former Soviet lands, they could see Moscow reconsolidating power. Georgia’s pro-Western President Saakashvili has gone. Armenia just renounced its EU aspirations under Russian pressure a la Ukraine. The history of Iran’s rivalry with Russia long predates any hostilities with the US and that old specter has suddenly come back to life. Elsewhere, Sunnis have launched a widespread pushback against the Shiite bloc with pro-Saudi elements fighting Iran’s ally Assad to a standstill, Iraq roiled daily with truck bombs, bomb attacks against Iran’s embassy in Beirut. Unable to stave off rivals, to protect allies or feed its populace, the regime in Tehran could see the inevitable implosion coming.

#### Iran has to agree to the deal- they know all alternatives suck for them too

Conca 11/30 [James Conca scientist in the field of the earth and environmental sciences for 31 years, specializing in geologic disposal of nuclear waste, energy-related research, subsurface transport and environmental clean-up of heavy metals Director of the New Mexico State University Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center, the independent and academic monitoring facility for the Department of Energy's WIPP site, a little-known deep geologic nuclear repository for bomb waste. I came to NMSU from Los Alamos National Laboratory where I was Project Leader for Radionuclide Geochemistry and its input into the Yucca Mt Project. Before that, I was on the faculty at Washington State University Tri-Cities. At the California Institute of Technology, I obtained a Ph.D. in Geochemistry in 1985 and a Masters in Planetary Science in 1981. I received a Bachelor's in Science in Geology/Biology from Brown University in 1979 11/30/2013 “The Iranian Nuclear Deal Is A Good One” Forbes http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/11/30/the-iranian-nuclear-deal-is-a-good-one/]

All other rhetoric is posturing. Isolation is the worst strategy for bringing a country into the civil world’s fold. Just look at North Korea. Rouhani has to move forward in a way that does not shame Iran. The celebration in Iran over this deal is a strong indication of the win-win nature of this deal, not the ridiculous charge of the opposition that the U.S. was taken for a ride. Iran wants to, and according to international law can, have a nuclear energy program, including enrichment and production, as long as it falls under the appropriate international controls and is not producing weapons.

### A2: Iran Cheats

#### Iran won’t back out on this deal- structural factors cause compliance

Conca 11/30 [James Conca scientist in the field of the earth and environmental sciences for 31 years, specializing in geologic disposal of nuclear waste, energy-related research, subsurface transport and environmental clean-up of heavy metals Director of the New Mexico State University Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center, the independent and academic monitoring facility for the Department of Energy's WIPP site, a little-known deep geologic nuclear repository for bomb waste. I came to NMSU from Los Alamos National Laboratory where I was Project Leader for Radionuclide Geochemistry and its input into the Yucca Mt Project. Before that, I was on the faculty at Washington State University Tri-Cities. At the California Institute of Technology, I obtained a Ph.D. in Geochemistry in 1985 and a Masters in Planetary Science in 1981. I received a Bachelor's in Science in Geology/Biology from Brown University in 1979 11/30/2013 “The Iranian Nuclear Deal Is A Good One” Forbes http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/11/30/the-iranian-nuclear-deal-is-a-good-one/]

Old orders are falling in the Middle East. The region is in upheaval, Shia and Sunni are as far apart as ever, and Iran’s theocracy, embodied by their new President Hassan Rouhani, has decided that the cost/benefit of maintaining an expensive, useless nuclear program that is still a long way from producing a reliable weapon, while being starved by a barrage of sanctions, on the heels of a global economic meltdown, has now gone into the too-much-cost-and-not-enough-benefit category.¶ Thus, there is now an opening to change the game.¶ This deal is not about trust, as the last point above about access addresses. No one trusts governments, even supposedly good ones. There must be unfettered access to verify that the nuclear facilities are not being used to produce weapons and that is what this deal allows, and it will be easy to determine when Iran breaks this deal (The Economist; The Guardian; Fox News).

#### Deal solves cheating

Cirincione 11-25 [Joseph Cirincione is president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and a member of Secretary of State John Kerry's International Security Advisory Board and the Council on Foreign Relations. He's also the author of "Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons." Interviewed by Ezra Klein 11-25-2013 “‘If you don’t like negotiating with Iran what you’re really saying is you want to go to war’” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/25/if-you-dont-like-negotiating-with-iran-what-youre-really-saying-is-you-want-to-go-to-war/]

EK: Israel and some other skeptics argue that diluting the uranium doesn’t mean much because Iran can quickly enrich it again.¶ JC: Not clear. There’s a lot of doubt that Iran has the capability to convert uranium oxide back to uranium gas. In any event, if they did it we would see it. That’s the benefit of the daily inspections.

### Iran Prolif Bad- Fast

#### Iran can get the bomb fast

Jay Solomon September 3, 2011 Wall Street Journal “Iran's Nuclear Experiments Raise Alarm at U.N. Agency” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111903895904576546922988105258.html

U.S. officials currently believe that Iran would need around two years to produce nuclear weapons if Tehran made the strategic decision to begin converting its stockpile of low-enriched uranium to the much higher weapons-grade levels. This timeline, though, could be significantly shortened if Iran successfully deploys significant numbers of the faster IR-2m and IR-4 machines, U.S. and European officials said.

### Iran Prolif Bad-Deterrence

#### Middle East deterrence is unstable – nuclear war is likely.

Michael Eisenstadt, senior fellow and director of the Military and Security Studies Program at The Washington Institute, and Patrick Clawson, deputy director for research at The Washington Institute. Previously, he spent five years as senior research professor at the National Defense University’s Institute for National Strategic Studies, and four years each at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Foreign Policy Research Institute, July, 2007. “Deterrence and Regime Change,” Deterring the Ayatollahs Complications in Applying Cold War Strategy to Iran, THE WASHINGTON INSTITUTE FOR NEAR EAST POLICY, online

The regional security environment in the Middle East hardly offers promising conditions for stable deterrence. The United States and Israel are still reeling from the impact of wars in Iraq and Lebanon, respectively, that have undermined their deterrent image and emboldened adversaries and enemies such as Syria and Iran. Such circumstances could increase the likelihood of a miscalculation that could spark a crisis between an increasingly assertive Iran and the United States or Israel, with the attendant possibility of escalation, an exchange of nuclear threats, or worse.

#### Brink-think ensures rational calculations always err towards preemption and war.

Efraim Inbar, Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies, March, 2006. “THE NEED TO BLOCK A NUCLEAR IRAN,” Middle East Review of International Affairs, Vol. 10, No. 1, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue1/Inbar.pdf

While it can be argued that Middle East leaders behave rationally, many of them engage in "brinkmanship" leading to miscalculation. Even of greater consequence, their sensitivity to costs and their attitudes to human life hardly conform to Western values. Iranian leaders have said that they are ready to pay a heavy price for the destruction of the Jewish state. For example, on December 14, 2001, the Ayatollah Ali Akbar Hashemi- Rafsanjani declared that the use of a nuclear bomb against Israel would destroy the Jewish state, producing only "damages in the Muslim world."20 Moreover, while Arab leaders issued similar statements in the past, the historical animosity between Persians and Arabs could also produce motivations to use nuclear weapons under extreme circumstances. Strong mutual mistrust, a basic feature of Middle Eastern political culture, creates a psychological environment that is conducive to rigidity and inflexibility. These are highly dangerous qualities in a nuclear situation, where it is important to leave the enemy a way to retreat, what Thomas Schelling calls the "last clear chance."21 The "dialectics of the antagonists"22 in the Middle East can hardly turn a "balance of terror" into a "balance of prudence," in which each adversary exerts maximum caution and consideration, permitting coexistence. Nuclear deterrence is probably harder to achieve than deterrence theorists had believed, because there is great variation in how people calculate their interests and react to threats.

### Nuke Power Mod

#### Iran deal is key to future spread of nuclear power globally without prolif

Conca 11/30 [James Conca scientist in the field of the earth and environmental sciences for 31 years, specializing in geologic disposal of nuclear waste, energy-related research, subsurface transport and environmental clean-up of heavy metals Director of the New Mexico State University Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center, the independent and academic monitoring facility for the Department of Energy's WIPP site, a little-known deep geologic nuclear repository for bomb waste. I came to NMSU from Los Alamos National Laboratory where I was Project Leader for Radionuclide Geochemistry and its input into the Yucca Mt Project. Before that, I was on the faculty at Washington State University Tri-Cities. At the California Institute of Technology, I obtained a Ph.D. in Geochemistry in 1985 and a Masters in Planetary Science in 1981. I received a Bachelor's in Science in Geology/Biology from Brown University in 1979 11/30/2013 “The Iranian Nuclear Deal Is A Good One” Forbes http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2013/11/30/the-iranian-nuclear-deal-is-a-good-one/]

As much as some leaders in Israel and Saudi Arabia want to use the U.S. to decapitate their nemesis, this is not the point of these talks. And what happens here goes far beyond just Iran. We need nuclear energy to spread around the world without proliferating weapons. How we handle Iran will determine the future of nuclear energy in many countries outside of the developed world, and we better get it right. There will always be pressures to develop weapons and we need strategies and experience in diverting these programs away from weapons.

#### Nuclear power is necessary to avoid four degrees warming

Comeau 3-12

[Steve, a database programmer and a member of Local Motion, a Burlington-based group that promotes people-powered transportation, “Comeau: Nuclear power can be tool in avoiding global warming”, http://vtdigger.org/2013/03/12/comeau-nuclear-power-can-be-tool-in-avoiding-global-warming/]

Nuclear power is used to generate electricity, primarily replacing the use of coal for that purpose. In the two years since the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear facility disaster hundreds of thousands of people worldwide have died from air pollution related to burning coal. According to the World Health Organization, “Urban outdoor air pollution is estimated to cause 1.3 million deaths worldwide per year.” Much of that pollution can be attributed to coal, which accounts for over 40 percent of electricity generated in the world. Burning coal produces massive amounts of waste products including fly ash, sulfur dioxide, mercury, and other heavy metals. Burning coal is bad for the environment and human health. But the biggest issue with burning coal is that it is the largest contributor of CO2 emissions, and therefore a huge contributor to human-caused global warming. To make progress on reducing CO2 emissions related to global warming, coal needs to stay in the ground. Of course there are many political and economic forces that make this close to impossible, but it can only be done if the electricity produced by coal is replaced. The replacements available for that purpose are natural gas, renewable energy, and nuclear power. These all have issues and risks, but are far cleaner and with fewer health consequences than coal. There are many interesting developments that will allow nuclear power to be safer, produce less waste, and even use up the existing nuclear waste. Bill Gates is promoting a company called TerraPower, developing the Traveling Wave Reactor. Environmentalist Stewart Brand, editor of the Whole Earth Catalog, supports nuclear power and the development of integral fast reactors that use uranium more efficiently and can use waste from other reactors. James Hansen, a leading climate scientist and now an activist, also supports third- and fourth-generation nuclear reactors as a way to avert climate change. The projections from a variety of sources depict that CO2 emissions will decline slowly in the United States and likely continue to increase around the world — so pretty much a “business-as-usual” scenario. A report by PricewaterhouseCoopers, “Too late for two degrees,” shows that in 2001 the world energy related emissions grew by 3 percent. China’s emissions grew by 9.4 percent, but emissions in the United States dropped by 1.9 percent, in part due to a mild winter. The most revealing and useful metric is the CO2 measurements taken at the Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii since 1959. Based on the trend of the CO2 measurements over the past 20 years, the atmospheric CO2 level — currently at 396 ppm (parts per million) — will reach 450 ppm in 2034. This is approximately the level of CO2 where the average global temperature will increase by 2 degrees (3.6 degrees F) over the pre-industrial level. Based on the latest climate change science, disruptive climate change is occurring now and will continue to occur with increased warming. That part is certain. What is uncertain is the intensity and timing of the transition to dangerous climate change, the threshold which is thought to be 2 degrees C of warming over the pre-industrial level. According to a report published in November 2012 by the World Bank, titled “Turn Down the Heat — Why a 4℃ Warmer World Must be Avoided,” if the current commitments and pledges for reducing emissions are not fully implemented, warming of 4 degrees C (7.2 degrees F) could occur as early as the 2060s. This level of warming will likely produce enormous environmental harm, as well as social and economic disruption. I encourage everyone to download and read this World Bank report. We need a greater understanding and appreciation of the magnitude of the projected harm that dangerous climate change can cause. People will adapt to climate change, but that adaptation will include migration and displacement that is orders of magnitude greater than that caused by the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear facility disaster. That adaptation will include the abandonment of large cities flooded by a rising sea and migration from regions parched by drought. The warming and CO2 levels will last for centuries and change the world ecosystems. To postpone or avert the greatest harm from climate change it is necessary to accept the risks and potential harm that come with nuclear power, renewable energy, and natural gas, because the alternative is so much worse. The environmentalist positions against the energy technologies that offer effective solutions for replacement of coal are not helpful. As stated in the World Bank report: “The projected 4℃ warming must not be allowed to occur — the heat must be turned down.”

### Russia Expansionism Mod

#### Negotiations are key to solve Russian expansionism

Kaylan 11-25 [Melik Kaylan has written about ancient places, warzones, political upheavals and far frontiers for the Wall Street Journal and Newsweek since the 1990s. That covers an area from the China-North Korea border to the Caucasus, to Iraq, Iran, Syria, Turkey to Eastern Europe. Submerging markets. 11-25-2013 Forbes “Is The Iran Deal Good Or Bad?” http://www.forbes.com/sites/melikkaylan/2013/11/25/is-the-iran-deal-good-or-bad/]

So, the mullahs need this pause more than anyone. Even then, macro-picture will not change overall, whatever happens in Geneva over the next six months. Even if their side wins outright in Syria, they and Assad will inherit a country-sized mound of rubble. Moscow’s power keeps expanding. The Saudis have essentially declared global jihad against Iranian interests everywhere. A nuke or two in Iran’s arsenal won’t affect Tehran’s strategic quandary. The only card they have to play, especially against Moscow, is to pivot Westward. A pro-West Iran opens a roadway to Central Asia and the Stans, all Iran’s neighbors, all of whom have fallen back under Moscow’s sway. Iran can become a trade pathway that can liberate an entire swath of Asia’s resources from Russia’s grip. Handled right, this demarche by the Obama administration may tilt the entire global strategic balance. But one musn’t overventilate. This is just a pause, perhaps a beginning. Let us at least refrain from strangling it at birth.¶

#### Nuclear war

Blank 2009 (Stephen Blank, Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, March 2009, “Russia And Arms Control: Are There Opportunities For The Obama Administration?,” online)

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation. 168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need. 169 Simultaneously, The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD. First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author 170 ) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances 7 in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD. 171 Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes, But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.

### A2: Republicans Good- Asia Pivot Bad F/L

#### Pivot is not inevitable-China is peacefully developing- efforts to contain China cause backlash

Etzioni 2012 [Amitai Etzioni served as a senior advisor to the Carter White House; taught at Columbia University, Harvard and The University of California at Berkeley; and is a university professor and professor of international relations at The George Washington University June 14, 2012 The National Interest “Obama's Asia 'Bluff'” http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/obamas-asia-bluff-7051]

When a leading expert on military affairs recently told a Brookings Institution meeting that President Obama’s much-touted pivot to Asia was “a bluff,” I considered the statement way off the mark. But since then, I have concluded that there is indeed less to Obama’s grand change in strategy than meets the eye. In fact, the pivot makes little sense. This suggests that one ought to look for domestic explanations.¶ The media points to the drawdown of American troops in the Middle East (particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan) and their increase in the Far East as exhibit one of the realignment of American military forces called for by the pivot. Actually, the new commitment to Asia is minuscule. The press refers to new deployment of 2,500 Marines in the region, but only 250 troops have actually arrived to date. The remainder are not expected to arrive for years. Furthermore, even when in full force—some say ten years from now—the Marines will add little to the 55,442 troops already stationed in the Asia-Pacific region at the end of last year, mostly in Japan (36,708), Guam (4,272) and afloat (13,618).¶ Defense Secretary Leon Panetta announced in early June that there also will be a shift in U.S. naval forces. While until now the United States has divided its warships roughly equally between the Atlantic and the Pacific, the Pacific will now host 60 percent of the fleet, albeit of a smaller fleet.¶ However, Panetta stressed that it will “take years for these concepts, and many of the investments we are making, to be fully realized.” There also will be more frequent visits by the American warships in Asian ports, and some ships will be berthed in Singapore, which is sure to delight the sailors and some local professionals but otherwise not matter much.¶ More significant is the question of what role these forces will play in the region. Obviously, our troops—even as augmented with a few Marines—are not meant to engage in any forthcoming military confrontation with China, with its constantly expanding and increasingly modernized army consisting of 2,285,000 active troops.¶ Nor is there any sign that China seeks a military confrontation with the United States. Although China’s military capacity is expanding, even the most hawkish American observers do not think China could stage such a confrontation for at least a decade. Moreover, that the Marines will be located 2,600 miles away from China reveals they are not meant to serve as a tripwire, which would entail placing them on the beaches of Taiwan or at the island chains contested in the South China Sea.¶ Military analysts will argue that these moves are not meant to provide a substantial realignment of military assets but rather to send a message. But as moviemaker Samuel Goldwyn famously quipped, “If you want to send a message, use Western Union.” Using troops does send a message—but is it one we wish to send?¶ Both Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski strongly favored heightened U.S. attempts to engage China as a partner in maintaining global order and urged “co-evolution” with China rather than attempts to contain it. There remains plenty of time to turn to military moves if China refuses to become a responsible stakeholder in the international order. True, China has made several rather assertive claims in the South China Sea, but these have almost uniformly involved laying claims as a starting point for negotiations. The United States may feel that it ought to support countries close to China, such as Vietnam, Malaysia and the Philippines, so that they will not risk being bullied by the rising global power. However, this can be accomplished through treaties, trade and aid without resorting to the present U.S. strategy of militarizing the conflict.¶ Why then the military “pivot to Asia”? It does make sense as one part of an election-year campaign, designed to deprive the GOP of one of its favorite and winning claims: that Democrats are weak on foreign policy. The more American voters concentrate on the Far East—in which no war looms and we can act as tough as we want without facing short-term consequences or exorbitant expenditures—the more they might be distracted from the shambles in Afghanistan and the resurgence of Al Qaeda in Yemen and Somalia. Hence, the better the world looks.¶ Mitt Romney’s hawkish statements about China and Russia suggest the Democrats are not the only ones seeking to play this card. Both sides should note, though, that the message is being received. China is likely to respond in kind by further accelerating its military buildup and repositioning some of its own forces. Indeed, it may well deepen its already considerable military ties with Pakistan. The notion that the United States could bankrupt China by involving it in an arms race, as Reagan did to speed the disintegration of the Soviet Union, is fanciful given that the United States is in more dire economic straits than is China and that China can invest in next-generation cyber weapons, space arms and antiship missiles without straining its economy.

#### Asia pivot is seen as containment- causes China to build up more

Glaser 2012 [Bonnie S. Glaser senior fellow with the ¶ Freeman Chair in China Studies at CSIS, where ¶ she works on issues related to Chinese foreign and ¶ security policy. Prior to joining CSIS, she served as ¶ a consultant for various U.S. government offices, ¶ including the Departments of Defense and State. ¶ Ms. Glaser has written extensively on Chinese threat ¶ perceptions and views of the strategic environment ¶ and on China’s foreign policy 2012 “Pivot to Asia: Prepare for Unintended Consequence” Center for Strategic and International Studies http://csis.org/files/publication/120405\_GF\_Final\_web-sm.pdf]

The Obama administration’s initial policy in ¶ 2009 raised fears in many Asian capitals of a ¶ G2 condominium that would make decisions ¶ over the heads of others. Those concerns were ¶ unwarranted and short lived. Beijing interpreted ¶ the U.S. approach as weakness, which, along ¶ with China’s economic success and America’s ¶ struggles, led to a year of Chinese hubris that ¶ manifested itself in a series of intimidating ¶ actions in China’s neighborhood. Subsequent ¶ entreaties by regional states to counterbalance ¶ China increased U.S. attention to the Asia-Pacific ¶ region. Now, the U.S. Asia “pivot” has prompted ¶ Chinese anxiety about U.S. containment and ¶ heightened regional worries about intensified ¶ U.S.-China strategic competition.¶ In the run-up to the leadership transition that will ¶ take place at China’s 18th Party Congress this fall, ¶ Beijing is inwardly focused and unlikely to act on ¶ its fears. However, 2013 could see a shift in Chinese ¶ foreign policy based on the new leadership’s ¶ judgment that it must respond to a U.S. strategy ¶ that seeks to prevent China’s reemergence as a ¶ great power.¶ Signs of a potential harsh reaction are already ¶ detectable. The U.S. Asia pivot has triggered ¶ an outpouring of anti-American sentiment in ¶ China that will increase pressure on China’s ¶ incoming leadership to stand up to the United ¶ States. Nationalistic voices are calling for military ¶ countermeasures to the bolstering of America’s ¶ military posture in the region and the new ¶ U.S. defense strategic guidelines. For example, ¶ an article published in China’s Global Times, a ¶ jingoistic newspaper owned by the Communist ¶ Party mouthpiece People’s Daily, called for China ¶ to strengthen its long-range strike capabilities.

#### Containment causes China relations collapse- the pivot is largely symbolic so there is no deterrent benefit

Carpenter 2011 [Ted Galen Carpenter Senior fellow for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, is the author of eight books on international affairs November 30, 2011 The National Interest “Washington’s Clumsy China Containment Policy” http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/washington%E2%80%99s-clumsy-china-containment-policy-6202]

Those moves, along with previous efforts to strengthen cooperative military ties with other traditional allies such as South Korea and Japan and one-time U.S. adversaries such as Vietnam, have all the earmarks of a rather unsubtle containment policy directed against China. It is a foolish strategy that will complicate and perhaps permanently damage the crucial U.S.-China relationship. Perhaps even worse, it is a containment strategy that is long on symbolism and short on substance, thereby managing to be simultaneously provocative and ineffectual.¶ Take the U.S. decision to send 2,500 Marines to Australia. It is hard to imagine a scenario in which such a small deployment would be militarily useful. If there is a security contingency somewhere in East Asia, it is likely to be decided by air and naval power, not a meager force of Marines. Yet, while militarily useless, such a deployment conveys a hostile message to Beijing, thereby managing to antagonize the Chinese.¶ A similar conclusion is warranted with regard to the Obama administration’s transparent effort to revitalize the nearly moribund alliance with the Philippines. That chronically misgoverned, third-rate military power would hardly make a good security partner in any crisis. Yet by siding with a country that is deeply embroiled with China over territorial claims in the South China Sea, the United States once again appears to be going out of its way to antagonize Beijing.¶ That would be an ill-advised approach under the best of circumstances. But to embrace a containment policy—especially one that is primarily bluster and symbolism—when Washington badly needs China to continue funding the seemingly endless flow of U.S. Treasury debt verges on being dim-witted. It’s never a good idea to anger one’s banker. And one can assume that Beijing is watching U.S. actions, not just the pro-forma assurances that the United States wants good relations and does not regard China as a threat. Those assurances ring increasingly hollow, and one can assume that Chinese leaders will react accordingly. That does not bode well for the future of the U.S.-China relationship.

#### U.S.-China relations key to global warming cooperation – key to global solution.

Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Visiting Fellow @ Foreign Policy and David B. Sandalow, Senior Fellow @ Foreign Policy, 9-23-2009, Overcoming Obstacles to U.S.-China Cooperation on Climate Change, The Brookings Institution, http://www.brookings.edu/ reports/2009/01\_climate\_change\_lieberthal\_sandalow.aspx

Opportunities for collaboration in fighting climate change are plentiful, but moving forward at the scale needed will require high-level political support in two very different societies, each with considerable suspicion of the other. This report recommends ways to win such support and sustain it for the long term. Chapter 1 of the report provides a primer on two topics: climate change and U.S.-China relations. It describes the climate change threat, concluding that every year of delay in responding to it puts both countries—and the planet—at greater risk. Because the United States and China are the world’s top two greenhouse gas emitters, together accounting for more than 40% of annual emissions, **any solution requires both countries** to transition to low-carbon economies. U.S.-China cooperation on climate change would have **not only bilateral but global benefits**.

#### Warming causes extinction

Sify ’10 [Sydney newspaper citing Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at University of Queensland and Director of the Global Change Institute, and John Bruno, associate professor of Marine Science at UNC (Sify News, “Could unbridled climate changes lead to human extinction?” ]

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of greenhouse gases are driving irreversible and dramatic changes in the way the oceans function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. The findings of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' emerged from a synthesis of recent research on the world's oceans, carried out by two of the world's leading marine scientists. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is further evidence that we are well on the way to the next great extinction event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly if the trend continues. The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added. The 'fundamental and comprehensive' changes to marine life identified in the report include rapidly warming and acidifying oceans, changes in water circulation and expansion of dead zones within the ocean depths. These are driving major changes in marine ecosystems: less abundant coral reefs, sea grasses and mangroves (important fish nurseries); fewer, smaller fish; a breakdown in food chains; changes in the distribution of marine life; and more frequent diseases and pests among marine organisms. Study co-author John F Bruno, associate professor in marine science at The University of North Carolina, says greenhouse gas emissions are modifying many physical and geochemical aspects of the planet's oceans, in ways 'unprecedented in nearly a million years'. 'This is causing fundamental and comprehensive changes to the way marine ecosystems function,' Bruno warned, according to a GCI release.

#### Causes hardliner consolidation and China war

Harvey M. Sapolsky et al is a professor of public policy and organization at MIT. Benjamin H. Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute. Eugene Gholz is an associate professor of public affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. Daryl G. Press is an associate professor of government at Dartmouth College. World Affairs Fall 2009 “Restraining Order: For Strategic Modesty” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/restraining-order-strategic-modesty

Each of the two main strategic alternatives to restraint, primacy and global engagement, suffers from major flaws. Primacists seek to contain peer-competitors to America, especially China. They hope to dissuade Beijing from building a military to match its growing economic power. Some even want to destabilize the Beijing government by accelerating China’s liberalization in ways that would make modernization difficult to control, or by trying to embarrass the government (militarily or otherwise) in a way that would cause decades of political and economic disarray. Such an anti-China strategy is unwise. First, it is far from guaranteed that China will continue its economic rise or successfully manage the social strains that its government already faces. And a policy of active containment (let alone a policy of destabilization) may even make it easy for leaders in Beijing to rally nationalist sentiment against the United States and distract attention from their own failings. This sort of anti-China strategy accomplishes only one thing for sure: it turns tomorrow’s potential adversary into today’s certain one.

#### Regional regimes solve their offense- ensures no arms race

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

Asia is also ready for a decreased U.S. military presence, and Washington should begin gradually withdrawing its troops. Although China has embarked on an ambitious policy of military modernization and engages in periodic saber rattling in the South China Sea, its ability to project power remains limited. Japan and South Korea are already shouldering greater defense burdens than they were during the Cold War. India, the Philippines, and Vietnam are eager to forge strategic partnerships with the United States. Given the shared interest in promoting regional security, these ties could be sustained through bilateral political and economic agreements, instead of the indefinite deployments and open-ended commitments of the Cold War.

### A2: Republicans Good- Asia Pivot Bad- NK War

#### Aggressive policy in the region creates NK war- deterrence is ineffective

IBT 10-6, International Business Times, "Reports Say South Korea, US Revise Defense Agreement; North Korean Media Call For ’Great War’", <http://www.ibtimes.com/reports-say-south-korea-us-revise-defense-agreement-north-korean-media-call-great-war-842375>

North Korea’s state-run news agency published sinister warnings of a new war in the Korean peninsula even as South Korean media reported Saturday that Seoul and Washington had reached an agreement on extending the range of South Korean ballistic missiles to counter defense threat from Pyongyang.¶ The KCNA website showed the warnings across its front page. "Let’s realize the nation’s desire for a great war for national reunification,” the message read.¶ "We will mercilessly punish aggressors, provokers through national actions,” the message continued. "U.S. imperialists and South Korean Lee Myung Bak regime should not act reckless.”¶ South Korea’s Chosun Ilbo daily cited an unnamed government official to report an agreement reached by Washington and Seoul on extending the range of the ballistic missiles to 800 kilometers from the current 300 kilometers to cover all of North Korea.¶ The unnamed government source was quoted as saying that the two sides have also agreed to maintain the payload limit at the current level of 500 kilograms as under an agreement signed in 1979, which was revised in 2001 between the two military allies, Reuters reported.¶ However, if South Korea settles for a lesser missile range limit of 550 kilometers, it could increase the payload to one ton, the newspaper said.¶ Yonhap news agency also reported that an agreement had been reached between the two nations.¶ South Korean Foreign Minister Kim Sung-hwan told a parliamentary hearing Friday that negotiation with the U.S. over the missile issue had reached the "final stage,” without furnishing further details.¶ The KCNA warnings of a war and South Korean media reports on a revised defense agreement closely followed North Korean Vice Foreign Minister Pak Kil-yon’s address to the U.N. General Assembly earlier this week lashing out at the U.S. for its “hostile” policy toward Pyongyang that has left the Korean peninsula a “spark” away from a “thermonuclear war.”¶ "Today, due to the continued U.S. hostile policy towards DPRK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), the vicious cycle of confrontation and aggravation of tensions is an ongoing phenomenon on the Korean peninsula, which has become the world's most dangerous hot spot where a spark of fire could set off a thermonuclear war," Pak said.

### A2: Republicans Good- Asia Pivot Bad- China No Rise

#### China can’t catch up and no risk of war

**Zenko and Cohen 12** (Micah Zenko, Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, and MIchael Cohen, Senior Fellow at the American Security Project, serves on the board of the National Security Network and has taught at Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs, served in the U.S. Department of State, former Senior Vice President at the strategic communications firm of Robinson, Lerer and Montgomery, bachelor’s degree in international relations from American University and a master’s degree from Columbia University, 3/14/2012, "Clear and Present Safety", yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/clear-and-present-safety)

As the threat from transnational terrorist groups dwindles, the United States also faces few risks from other states. China is the most obvious potential rival to the United States, and there is little doubt that China’s rise will pose a challenge to U.S. economic interests. Moreover, there is an unresolved debate among Chinese political and military leaders about China’s proper global role, and the lack of transparency from China’s senior leadership about its long-term foreign policy objectives is a cause for concern. However, the present security threat to the U.S. mainland is practically nonexistent and will remain so. Even as China tries to modernize its military, its defense spending is still approximately one-ninth that of the United States. In 2012, the Pentagon will spend roughly as much on military research and development alone as China will spend on its entire military. While China clumsily flexes its muscles in the Far East by threatening to deny access to disputed maritime resources, a recent Pentagon report noted that China’s military ambitions remain dominated by “regional contingencies” and that the People’s Liberation Army has made little progress in developing capabilities that “extend global reach or power projection.” In the coming years, China will enlarge its regional role, but this growth will only threaten U.S. interests if Washington attempts to dominate East Asia and fails to consider China’s legitimate regional interests. It is true that China’s neighbors sometimes fear that China will not resolve its disputes peacefully, but this has compelled Asian countries to cooperate with the United States, maintaining bilateral alliances that together form a strong security architecture and limit China’s room to maneuver. The strongest arguments made by those warning of Chinese influence revolve around economic policy. The list of complaints includes a host of Chinese policies, from intellectual property theft and currency manipulation to economic espionage and domestic subsidies. Yet none of those is likely to lead to direct conflict with the United States beyond the competition inherent in international trade, which does not produce zero-sum outcomes and is constrained by dispute-resolution mechanisms, such as those of the World Trade Organization. If anything, China’s export-driven economic strategy, along with its large reserves of U.S. Treasury bonds, suggests that Beijing will continue to prefer a strong United States to a weak one.

#### Not an aggressive power now

Thompson 2010 [Drew Thompson is director of China studies and Starr senior fellow at the Nixon Center MARCH/APRIL 2010 “Think Again: China's Military” Foreign Policy http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/22/think\_again\_chinas\_military?page=0,6]

But widespread perceptions of China as an aggressive, expansionist power are off base. Although China's relative power has grown significantly in recent decades, the main tasks of Chinese foreign policy are defensive and have not changed much since the Cold War era: to blunt destabilizing influences from abroad, to avoid territorial losses, to reduce its neighbors' suspicions, and to sustain economic growth. What has changed in the past two decades is that China is now so deeply integrated into the world economic system that its internal and regional priorities have become part of a larger quest: to define a global role that serves Chinese interests but also wins acceptance from other powers.

#### Economic barriers prevent rise

Derek **Scissors 12**, Research Fellow in Economics at the Asian Studies Center of the Heritage Foundation and Adjunct Professor of Economics at George Washington, “The Wobbly Dragon”, Foreign Affairs, January/February

Arvind Subramanian claims that China will unquestionably replace the United States as the dominant global power in the next two decades ("The Inevitable Superpower," September/October 2011). He is right that if the U.S. economy continues on its current trajectory, the United States will not be able to maintain its position of global leadership. But he is far too bullish on China. Subramanian overlooks Chinese policies that will complicate the country's economic rise and ignores the possibility that Chinese growth will simply stop. And he uses a definition of "dominance" that bears little resemblance to the U.S.-style preeminence he sees China assuming. Consider how Subramanian measures China's growing power. He cites the ability of Beijing to convince African countries to recognize it instead of Taipei, but out-muscling Taiwan diplomatically is hardly a sign of global leadership. He sees the ease with which China undervalues the yuan by pegging it to the dollar as proof of the country's strength, but hiding behind a foreign currency is not a sign of economic might. He forecasts that China in 2030 will have an economy that is one-third larger than the United States', yet he admits that it will remain only half as wealthy. These are notable trends, to be sure, but not ones that indicate China will attain anything close to the position the United States has held over the past 60 years. The biggest flaw in Subramanian's index of dominance is the importance he assigns to China's status as a net creditor. Based on this alone, he is prepared to say that China's economic strength is already comparable to that of the United States. But China's creditor status does not make up for the fact that its economy is presently less than half the size of the United States' and its people are barely one-tenth as wealthy as Americans. Creditor status is also a misleading metric by which to judge China because it is usually used to describe financially open economies, and China is largely closed. Countries with open economies can invest their money in many places. Beijing, because it cannot spend its foreign reserves at home, is forced to keep buying U.S. Treasury bonds. China's creditor status arises largely from its weaknesses, not its strengths. The country's $3.2 trillion worth of foreign currency holdings represents an imbalance between investment and consumption. Instead of loaning money to rich countries, China should be importing capital in order to speed its domestic development and meet its sizable needs, starting with properly capitalized pension and financial systems. China's financial books are strictly divided, with huge assets in foreign currency (primarily dollars) on one side and huge liabilities in local currency on the other. Local governments have incurred high debts by spending heavily on programs such as railroad expansion and by borrowing to fund the 2009 stimulus (which came mostly from local, not national, government coffers). Beijing should be paying down this debt and addressing other domestic shortfalls with its mountain of foreign currency, but it cannot do so under its present balance-of-payments rules, which are designed to keep foreign currency in the hands of the national monetary authorities. Due to a closed capital account, domestic holders cannot send money overseas, and foreign currency can be converted to yuan only through the state financial system. The Chinese government has not let money flow freely because doing so would undermine its control of domestic interest rates, reducing its ability to influence economic cycles, and it would expose the domestic banking sector to devastating competition. If domestic entities were allowed to send money abroad, hundreds of billions of dollars would flee the country for financial institutions that operate commercially, unlike Chinese banks. Such a stark fear of competition does not suggest a country ready to exert dominance anytime soon. Lastly, Subramanian inflates China's financial influence over the United States, forgetting that influence in a buyer-seller relationship is determined not by what-if scenarios but by who has better alternatives. The United States has already diversified away from Chinese debt by having the Federal Reserve flood the U.S. financial system with liquidity. This is hardly ideal, but it has driven down the Chinese share of U.S. debt while keeping interest rates historically low. In contrast, Beijing, despite its best efforts to diversify, still holds 70 percent of its foreign currency reserves in dollars. The reason is simple: those reserves are so large and growing so quickly that there is no alternative. The United States needs China to keep U.S. interest rates below historic norms; China needs the United States to maintain its entire balance-of-payments system. Even if Subramanian acknowledges that China's lopsided financial system is holding the country back now, he assumes that Beijing will soon rewrite its balance-of-payments rules and become an open economy. This assumption underestimates the Communist Party's antipathy to change. In fact, the principal advocate for such reforms has been Washington, which hopes to encourage China's transformation from an investment-led to a consumption-led economy. Such a transition would undermine China's net creditor status--what Subramanian sees as its main claim to dominance. But implementing market reforms would also allow China to keep growing at its blistering pace and surpass the United States in GDP. If China insists on maintaining government control over development, on the other hand, its long-term growth prospects will be dim. Salvatore Babones ("The Middling Kingdom," September/October 2011) warns against drawing conclusions about China's trajectory by simply projecting its growth rates forward. Indeed, it is entirely possible that Chinese GDP growth will simply stop. Growth depends on land, labor, capital, and innovation. China has depleted its ecology, its labor surplus will soon begin to erode, and vast overspending has driven down the return on capital--all discouraging trends from the standpoint of growth. As for innovation, Subramanian praises China's growing technology sector and its ability to absorb new advances. But a true economic leader must create, not absorb, and Beijing's favoritism toward large state firms will hinder innovation. Moreover, the quality of the Chinese higher-education system is poor and not necessarily improving. A no-growth scenario is a genuine danger--just ask the Japanese. By underemphasizing or ignoring China's various weaknesses, Subramanian underestimates the United States' ability to influence the competition with China. That said, his criticisms of the United States are valid; indeed, his baseline prediction of U.S. growth at 2.5 percent annually may be too optimistic. Crippled by debt, the United States faces a period of stagnation. If the overall economy remains sluggish, a lack of import growth will cause trade to lag and further reduce the United States' global influence. Still, the Chinese dragon will not fly forward indefinitely, as Subramanian suggests; it may even crash. For the foreseeable future, China will not attain the kind of dominance the United States has long held. The world should not expect to crown a new global leader but prepare for the absence of one.

### A2: Republicans Good- Asia Pivot Bad-Containment Causes Conflict

#### China does not see our presence as benign

Nathan and Scobell 2012 [Andrew J. Nathan Class of 1919 Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and Andrew Scobell Senior Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation Foreign Affairs Sep/Oct 2012, Vol. 91, Issue 5 “How China Sees America” EBSCO]

Beijing views this seemingly contradictory set of American actions through three reinforcing perspectives. First, Chinese analysts see their country as heir to an agrarian, eastern strategic tradition that is pacifistic, defense-minded, nonexpansionist, and ethical. In contrast, they see Western strategic culture -- especially that of the United States -- as militaristic, offense-minded, expansionist, and selfish.¶ Second, although China has embraced state capitalism with vigor, the Chinese view of the United States is still informed by Marxist political thought, which posits that capitalist powers seek to exploit the rest of the world. China expects Western powers to resist Chinese competition for resources and higher-value-added markets. And although China runs trade surpluses with the United States and holds a large amount of U.S. debt, China's leading political analysts believe the Americans get the better end of the deal by using cheap Chinese labor and credit to live beyond their means.¶ Third, American theories of international relations have become popular among younger Chinese policy analysts, many of whom have earned advanced degrees in the United States. The most influential body of international relations theory in China is so-called offensive realism, which holds that a country will try to control its security environment to the full extent that its capabilities permit. According to this theory, the United States cannot be satisfied with the existence of a powerful China and therefore seeks to make the ruling regime there weaker and more pro-American. Chinese analysts see evidence of this intent in Washington's calls for democracy and its support for what China sees as separatist movements in Taiwan, Tibet, and Xinjiang.¶ Whether they see the United States primarily through a culturalist, Marxist, or realist lens, most Chinese strategists assume that a country as powerful as the United States will use its power to preserve and enhance its privileges and will treat efforts by other countries to protect their interests as threats to its own security. This assumption leads to a pessimistic conclusion: as China rises, the United States will resist. The United States uses soothing words; casts its actions as a search for peace, human rights, and a level playing field; and sometimes offers China genuine assistance. But the United States is two-faced. It intends to remain the global hegemon and prevent China from growing strong enough to challenge it. In a 2011 interview with Liaowang, a state-run Chinese newsmagazine, Ni Feng, the deputy director of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences' Institute of American Studies, summed up this view. "On the one hand, the United States realizes that it needs China's help on many regional and global issues," he said. "On the other hand, the United States is worried about a more powerful China and uses multiple means to delay its development and to remake China with U.S. values."

#### Chinese who see the US as benign are overwhelmed

Nathan and Scobell 2012 [Andrew J. Nathan Class of 1919 Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and Andrew Scobell Senior Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation Foreign Affairs Sep/Oct 2012, Vol. 91, Issue 5 “How China Sees America” EBSCO]

A small group of mostly younger Chinese analysts who have closely studied the United States argues that Chinese and American interests are not totally at odds. In their view, the two countries are sufficiently remote from each other that their core security interests need not clash. They can gain mutual benefit from trade and other common interests.¶ But those holding such views are outnumbered by strategists on the other side of the spectrum, mostly personnel from the military and security agencies, who take a dim view of U.S. policy and have more confrontational ideas about how China should respond to it. They believe that China must stand up to the United States militarily and that it can win a conflict, should one occur, by outpacing U.S. military technology and taking advantage of what they believe to be superior morale within China's armed forces. Their views are usually kept out of sight to avoid frightening both China's rivals and its friends.

#### Asia pivot strengthens perceptions that the US is dangerous to China- think it threatens the regime

Nathan and Scobell 2012 [Andrew J. Nathan Class of 1919 Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and Andrew Scobell Senior Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation Foreign Affairs Sep/Oct 2012, Vol. 91, Issue 5 “How China Sees America” EBSCO]

In the eyes of many Chinese analysts, since the end of the Cold War the United States has revealed itself to be a revisionist power that tries to reshape the global environment even further in its favor. They see evidence of this reality everywhere: in the expansion of NATO; the U.S. interventions in Panama, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo; the Gulf War; the war in Afghanistan; and the invasion of Iraq. In the economic realm, the United States has tried to enhance its advantages by pushing for free trade, running down the value of the dollar while forcing other countries to use it as a reserve currency, and trying to make developing countries bear an unfair share of the cost of mitigating global climate change. And perhaps most disturbing to the Chinese, the United States has shown its aggressive designs by promoting so-called color revolutions in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan. As Liu Jianfei, director of the foreign affairs division of the Central Party School of the Chinese Communist Party, wrote in 2005, "The U.S. has always opposed communist 'red revolutions' and hates the 'green revolutions' in Iran and other Islamic states. What it cares about is not 'revolution' but 'color.' It supported the 'rose,' 'orange', and 'tulip' revolutions because they served its democracy promotion strategy." As Liu and other top Chinese analysts see it, the United States hopes "to spread democracy further and turn the whole globe 'blue.'"

### A2: Republicans Good-Sequestration Inev

#### Its happening no matter what

Ewing 2014 [Phillip Ewing 5-28-2014 Politico “GOP gains might not help defense industry” http://www.politico.com/story/2014/05/republicans-2014-elections-defense-industry-107134.html]

McCain is not the Armed Services Committee’s biggest recipient of contributions from the defense industry, according to the Center for Responsive Politics, but that profile could change if he became the chairman. No amount of campaign donations or lobbying, however, appears likely to stop the return of automatic, across-the-board budget restrictions in fiscal year 2016.¶ Voiding or delaying those cuts would require the kind of strategic compromise on taxes and spending that has been impossible since Republicans took control of the House in 2010. It might even be less likely in an environment in which the GOP feels a new surge of support in Senate races across the country and Obama doesn’t want to give an inch.¶ “Politically, the president has made fixing defense problems related to sequester inherently linked to nondefense-related sequestration spending levels, so around and around we go,” Eaglen said.¶ Regardless of the outcome of November’s races, however, the Defense Department is preparing for the return of sequestration.¶ Defense officials have made clear that they want to go up against the potential return of sequestration in much better shape than they did the first round, when the Obama administration stuck by its gambit of trying to prevail by splitting Republican defense hawks from deficit hawks.¶ It lost. That gamble underestimated the strength of the new deficit-minded Republicans in town. So where before the Pentagon shrugged and pulled its pockets inside-out, now officials say they’re not going to play that game. Defense Comptroller Robert Hale told reporters earlier this year he was already getting ready.¶ “We are planning much more carefully for sequestration if we have to go through it” again.

## Republicans Good

### Asia Impact Calc

#### Most probable

Campbell 2008(Kurt M Campbell, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Dr. Campbell served in several capacities in government, including as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asia and the Pacific, Director on theNational Security Council Staff, previously the Chief Executive Officer and co-founder of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), served as Director of the Aspen Strategy Group and the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the Washington Quarterly, and was the founder and Principal of StratAsia, a strategic advisory company focused on Asia, rior to co-founding CNAS, he served as Senior Vice President, Director of the International Security Program, and the Henry A. Kissinger Chair in National Security Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, doctorate in International Relation Theory from Oxford, former associate professor of public policy and international relations at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Assistant Director of the Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, member of Council on Foreign Relations and  International Institute for Strategic Studies, “The Power of Balance: America in iAsia” June 2008, <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CampbellPatelSingh_iAsia_June08.pdf>)

Asian *investment* is also at record levels. Asian countries lead the world with unprecedented infra­structure projects. With over $3 trillion in foreign currency reserves, Asian nations and businesses are starting to shape global economic activity. Indian firms are purchasing industrial giants such as Arcelor Steel, as well as iconic brands of its once-colonial ruler, such as Jaguar and Range Rover. China’s Lenovo bought IBM’s personal computer¶ We call the transformations across the Asia-Pacific the emergence of “iAsia” to reflect the adoption by countries across Asia of fundamentally new stra­tegic approaches to their neighbors and the world. Asian nations are pursuing their interests with real power in a period of both tremendous potential and great uncertainty. iAsia is: *Integrating:* iAsia includes increasing economic interdependence and a flowering of multinational forums to deal with trade, cultural exchange, and, to some degree, security. *Innovating:* iAsia boasts the world’s most successful manufacturing and technology sectors and could start taking the lead in everything from finance to nanotech to green tech. *Investing:* Asian nations are developing infrastruc­ture and human capital at unprecedented rates. But the continent remains plagued by: Insecurity: Great-power rivalry is alive in Asia. Massive military investments along with historic suspicions and contemporary territorial and other conflicts make war in Asia plausible. Instability: From environmental degradation to violent extremism to trafficking in drugs, people, and weapons, Asian nations have much to worry about. *Inequality:* Within nations and between them, inequality in Asia is more stark than anywhere else in the world. Impoverished minorities in countries like India and China, and the gap in governance and capacity within countries, whether as back­ward as Burma or as advanced as Singapore, present unique challenges. A traditional approach to Asia will not suffice if the United States is to both protect American interests and help iAsia realize its potential and avoid pitfalls. business and the Chinese government, along with other Asian financial players, injected billions in capital to help steady U.S. investment banks such as Merrill Lynch as the American subprime mortgage collapse unfolded. Chinese investment funds regional industrialization, which in turn creates new markets for global products. Asia now accounts for over 40 percent of global consumption of steel 4 and China is consuming almost half of world’s available concrete. 5 Natural resources from soy to copper to oil are being used by China and India at astonishing rates, driving up commodity prices and setting off alarm bells in Washington and other Western capitals. Yet Asia is not a theater at peace. On average, between 15 and 50 people die every day from causes tied to conflict, and suspicions rooted in rivalry and nationalism run deep. The continent harbors every traditional and non-traditional challenge of our age: it is a cauldron of religious and ethnic tension; a source of terror and extrem­ism; an accelerating driver of the insatiable global appetite for energy; the place where the most people will suffer the adverse effects of global climate change; the primary source of nuclear proliferation; and the most likely theater on Earth for a major conventional confrontation and even a nuclear conflict. Coexisting with the optimism of iAsia are the ingredients for internal strife, non-traditional threats like terrorism, and traditional interstate conflict, which are all magnified by the risk of miscalculation or poor decision-making.

### Asia Pivot Good

#### Asia pivot solves Asian wars

Macgregor 2012 (Douglas A. Mcgregor, contributor and is executive vice president of Burke-Macgregor Group, LLC, retired Army colonel, October 26, 2012, Affording the “Pacific Pivot”, http://nation.time.com/2012/10/26/affording-the-pacific-pivot/)

In the turbulent decade leading up to the outbreak of World War I, Winston Churchill, Britain’s First Lord of the Admiralty, urged Britain’s national leadership to concentrate British naval power in the Atlantic and the North Sea where Germany’s rapidly expanding high seas fleet seemed determined to challenge British naval supremacy. Churchill reasoned, “It would be very foolish to lose England in safeguarding Egypt. If we win the big battle in the decisive theater, we can put everything else straight afterwards. If we lose it, there will not be any afterwards.” On the precipice of sequestration and with the survival of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid at stake, Churchill’s strategic rationale is instructive, particularly for leaders in Washington, D.C., who advocate a U.S. military buildup in the Pacific. When Churchill made the case for concentrating the British fleet in the Atlantic, he was practicing economy of force, a time honored principle in British military affairs. In 1902, in the midst of a financial crisis brought on, in part, by the Boer War, London had already turned to Japan for military assistance in blocking Russian expansion in the Far East. By 1911, the Russian threat had disappeared beneath the waters of the Tsushima Strait, but the Anglo-Japanese Treaty still allowed the withdrawal of British naval and ground forces from Asia, facilitating the concentration of British military power in the Atlantic. The result was a debilitating blockade Germany could not overcome throughout the First World War.Like the British at the beginning of the 20th Century, Washington suffers from a case of “Imperial Overstretch.” Washington needs a new national security strategy, one designed to halt the dissipation of American military resources around the world and to concentrate it wherever it is needed. For the moment, the point of concentration is Asia, where China’s assertiveness opens the door to the kind of instability and potential for strategic miscalculation that is eerily similar to the crises and conflicts that preceded the outbreak of World War I in Europe.

### Asia Prolif Impact

#### Triggers a massive arms race

Kemp 2010 (Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-5)

A third scenario, Asian Balance of Power, assumes that while economic growth on a global level resumes and India, China, and Japan continue to show economic strength, the overall prosperity of the Western world—particularly of the United States—weakens. That leads to increasing domestic pressures for the United States and Europe to pay less attention to security problems in the Middle East and Asia, given the high price that they already paid for intervention in the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century. While the Western World still has an interest in stable energy markets, there is less inclination to intervene and play the role of policeman. In the United States, there is an equivalent of the East of Suez debate that took place in Britain in the 1960s, when Britain decided to draw down its military presence in both the Indian Ocean and the Gulf. With the unilateral decision by the United States to draw down its presence, the major Asian powers—given that they continue to have unresolved problems among themselves**—**expand their own military forces, particularly their nuclear and maritime capabilities, ultimately leading to a triangular Asian arms race among India, China, and Japan. Under those circumstances, Japan is likely to obtain nuclear weapons, especially if the crisis on the Korean peninsula remains unresolved, and the security of the region ultimately will be in the hands of the Asian powers themselves. The sorts of alliances and arrangements that they make with the Gulf states and other Middle East countries would be uncertain. In all probability, India would play a key role, particularly in the Gulf. Indeed, India would be most assertive if it felt that China was encroaching on a region in which India believes that it should have hegemonic control.¶ A fourth scenario, International Cooperation, assumes that while the world economic situation may not be as rosy as outlined in the first scenario, there nevertheless remains a strong interest on the part of all the major industrial powers in ensuring secure energy supplies; as a result, the price of energy is kept at a reasonable level. The United States does not go through an East of Suez moment and continues to play a responsible and significant role in the maritime peacekeeping operations in the region. However, there is more pressure on the regional powers to share more of the burden and to participate in joint security operations ranging from sea control missions to cooperative ventures to curb terrorism, proliferation, and radicalism. Under these circumstances, the presence of the United States is seen as beneficial and reduces the tendency of the Asian powers to compete among themselves. While the U.S. commitment is not open ended, it serves long—term U.S. interests, in much the same way that the U.S. presence in Europe today continues to serve U.S. national interests. In this cooperative environment, local conflicts are easier to manage since it is in the interests of the all major powers to resist the forces of radicalism and proliferation—particularly nuclear terrorism.

#### Goes nuclear

Cirincione 2000 (Joseph, director of the Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Foreign Policy, “The Asian Nuclear Reaction Chain,” 3/22/00, lexis)

The blocks would fall quickest and hardest in Asia, where proliferation pressures are already building more quickly than anywhere else in the world. If a nuclear breakout takes place in Asia, then the international arms control agreements that have been painstakingly negotiated over the past 40 years will crumble. Moreover, the United States could find itself embroiled in its fourth war on the Asian continent in six decades--a costly rebuke to those who seek the safety of Fortress America by hiding behind national missile defenses. Consider what is already happening: North Korea continues to play guessing games with its nuclear and missile programs; South Korea wants its own missiles to match Pyongyang's; India and Pakistan shoot across borders while running a slow-motion nuclear arms race; China modernizes its nuclear arsenal amid tensions with Taiwan and the United States; Japan's vice defense minister is forced to resign after extolling the benefits of nuclear weapons; and Russia--whose Far East nuclear deployments alone make it the largest Asian nuclear power--struggles to maintain territorial coherence. Five of these states have nuclear weapons; the others are capable of constructing them. Like neutrons firing from a split atom, one nation's actions can trigger reactions throughout the region, which in turn, stimulate additional actions. These nations form an interlocking Asian nuclear reaction chain that vibrates dangerously with each new development. If the frequency and intensity of this reaction cycle increase, critical decisions taken by any one of these governments could cascade into the second great wave of nuclear-weapon proliferation, bringing regional and global economic and political instability and, perhaps, the first combat use of a nuclear weapon since 1945.

### A2 Asia Pivot Bad

#### We will be thought of as containing China no matter what- question if the credibility of that pivot

Schiavenza 2013 (Matt Schiavenza, editor of the Atlantic Monthly, April 15, 2013, “What Exactly Does It Mean That the U.S. Is Pivoting to Asia?,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/china/archive/2013/04/what-exactly-does-it-mean-that-the-us-is-pivoting-to-asia/274936/)

During his confirmation hearings in January, Kerry famously expressed ambivalence about the pivot to Asia, leading some to speculate that he might wish to "unpivot" back to Europe and the Middle East. Though the Chinese would surely love it if Washington retreated from the region, this is unlikely: Kerry ultimately doesn't call the shots in American foreign policy -- Obama does. And Obama, according to Justin Logan of the Cato Institute, is a firm believer in the pivot: he even prefers the term to the more neutral "re-balancing" introduced as a softer touch by his administration. ¶ But, as Logan cautions, second-term U.S. presidents have long been tempted by solving problems in the Middle East, particularly the Israel-Palestine crisis. And with the Syrian civil war, the Afghanistan pull-out, and a teetering Egypt, there's certainly enough going on in the region to merit the administration's attention. ¶ Nevertheless, the "pivot to Asia" isn't just whimsy -- for all the trite sloganeering around the "Asian Century", the continent will play an increasing role in American foreign policy going forward. So no- the pivot isn't reversible, even as the rest of the world continues to matter, too.

### A2: Iran Deal- No Deal

#### There won’t be a deal to ruin- negotiations are going nowhere

Nebehey and Irish 6-10[Stephanie Nebehey and John Irish 6-10-2014 Rueters UK “Iran questions nuclear deal deadline as talks 'hit wall'” http://uk.reuters.com/article/2014/06/10/uk-iran-nuclear-idUKKBN0EL0RX20140610]

Iran, after talks with senior U.S. officials, questioned whether a July deadline for a nuclear deal with world powers will be met, fuelling doubts on the outcome as France spoke out, saying talks on curbing Tehran's uranium enrichment had "hit a wall".¶ Iran's talks with six major powers on curbing its nuclear programme in exchange for an end to Western sanctions could be extended for six months if no deal is reached by a July 20 deadline agreed by all parties, a senior Iranian official said.¶ While an extension is possible under the terms of the talks, experts believe both Iran and the international powers may face domestic political pressures to argue for better terms during this extra time period, further complicating negotiations.

#### No one can agree on the centrifuges

Nebehey and Irish 6-10[Stephanie Nebehey and John Irish 6-10-2014 Rueters UK “Iran questions nuclear deal deadline as talks 'hit wall'” http://uk.reuters.com/article/2014/06/10/uk-iran-nuclear-idUKKBN0EL0RX20140610]

Singling out a big gap in negotiating positions that will be difficult to overcome in less than two months, France's foreign minister said Iran should drop a demand to have thousands of uranium enrichment centrifuges.¶ Instead it should restrict itself to a few hundred of the machines used to increase the concentration of the fissile isotope of the metal - a process that can make a weapon, though Iran denies it wants to do that.¶ Iran - which says its nuclear programme is peaceful and mainly aimed at generating electricity - has around 19,000 centrifuges, of which roughly 10,000 are operating, according to the U.N. nuclear agency. Enriched uranium can have both civilian and military uses, depending on the degree of refinement.¶ "We are still hitting a wall on one absolutely fundamental point, which is the number of centrifuges which allow enrichment," Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius told France Inter radio. "We say that there can be a few hundred centrifuges, but the Iranians want thousands, so we're not in the same framework."

#### Each side thinks the others demands are unrealistic

Nebehey and Irish 6-10[Stephanie Nebehey and John Irish 6-10-2014 Rueters UK “Iran questions nuclear deal deadline as talks 'hit wall'” http://uk.reuters.com/article/2014/06/10/uk-iran-nuclear-idUKKBN0EL0RX20140610]

Western officials say Iran wants to maintain a uranium enrichment capability far beyond what it currently needs for civilian purposes. Iran says it wants to avoid reliance on foreign suppliers of fuel for planned nuclear reactors.¶ The negotiations ran into difficulty last month with each side accusing the other of making unrealistic demands, raising doubts about prospects for a breakthrough next month. This week's bilateral talks between U.S. and Iranian officials were aimed at breaking the deadlock.

### Iran Deal Impact D

#### No impact to Iranian prolif--- they’ll be cautious and moderate

Waltz 2012 (Kenneth Waltz, senior research scholar at Saltzman, Political Science Professor at Columbia, September/October 2012, “Iran and the Bomb – Waltz Replies,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 5, p. 157-162)

In arguing that a nuclear-armed Iran would represent an unacceptable threat to the United States and its allies, Colin Kahl rejects my contention that states tend to become more cautious once they obtain nuclear weapons and claims that I minimize the potential threat of an emboldened Islamic Republic. He accuses me of misreading history and suggests that I overestimate the stability produced by nuclear deterrence. In fact, it is Kahl who misunderstands the historical record and who fails to grasp the ramifications of nuclear deterrence.¶ In Kahl's view, new nuclear states do not necessarily behave as status quo powers and can instead be highly revisionist. Seeking a precedent, he highlights the fact that the Soviet Union encouraged North Korea to launch a potentially risky invasion of South Korea in 1950, shortly after the Soviets had tested their first nuclear bomb. But Kahl neglects to explain the context of that decision. Some time before, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson had publicly identified the United States' security commitments in Asia; defending South Korea was not among them. The United States had also signaled its lack of interest in protecting the South Koreans by declining to arm them with enough weapons to repel a Soviet-backed invasion by the North. The Soviet Union therefore had good reason to assume that the United States would not respond if the North Koreans attacked. In light of these facts, it is difficult to see Stalin's encouragement of the invasion as an example of bold, revisionist behavior. Contrary to Kahl's claims, the beginning of the Korean War hardly supplies evidence of Soviet nuclear adventurism, and therefore it should not be understood as a cautionary tale when considering the potential impact that possessing a nuclear arsenal would have on Iranian behavior.¶ Kahl seems to accept that nuclear weapons create stability -- or a form of stability, at least. But he notes -- as do most scholars of nuclear matters, myself included -- that nuclear stability permits lower-level violence. Taking advantage of the protection that their atomic arsenals provide, nuclear-armed states can feel freer to make minor incursions, deploy terrorism, and engage in generally annoying behavior. But the question is how significant these disruptive behaviors are compared with the peace and stability that nuclear weapons produce.¶ Kahl points to the example of Pakistan, whose nuclear weapons have probably increased its willingness to wage a low-intensity fight against India, which makes the subcontinent more prone to crises. As Kahl correctly argues, Pakistan's increased appetite for risk probably played a role in precipitating the so-called Kargil War between India and Pakistan in 1999. But the Kargil War was the fourth war fought by the two countries, and it paled in comparison to the three wars they fought before they both developed nuclear weapons. In fact, the Kargil conflict was a war only according to social scientists, who oddly define "war" as any conflict that results in 1,000 or more battlefield deaths. By historical standards, that casualty rate constitutes little more than a skirmish. Far from proving that new nuclear states are not swayed by the logic of deterrence, the Kargil War supports the proposition that nuclear weapons prevent minor conflicts from becoming major wars. Indeed, nuclear weapons are the only peace-promoting weapons that the world has ever known, and there is no reason to believe that things would be different if Iran acquired such arms.¶ Kahl also frets that a nuclear-armed Iran would step up its support for terrorist groups. Terrorism is tragic for those whose lives it destroys and unnerving for countries that suffer from it. But the number of annual fatalities from international terrorism is vanishingly small compared with the casualties wrought by major wars. Of course, like Kahl, I would not welcome increased Iranian support for Hezbollah or an increased supply of more potent Iranian arms to Palestinian militants. And I, too, hope for a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the disputes between Israel and its neighbors. But the last several decades have not offered much reason to believe those goals can be easily attained, and I would rather see the possibility of major war reduced through nuclear stability, even if the price is an increase in disruptive activities and low-level conflict.¶ Just a few months ago in these pages, Kahl eloquently expressed his opposition to a proposed preventive strike on suspected Iranian nuclear facilities, warning that it could spark a regional war ("Not Time to Attack Iran," March/April 2012). I agree. But Kahl and I differ on what the United States can achieve in its showdown with the Islamic Republic. Kahl appears to believe that it is possible for the United States to forgo risky military action and still prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons through a combination of sanctions and diplomacy. I strongly doubt that. Short of using military force, it is difficult to imagine how Iran could be prevented from acquiring nuclear weapons if it is determined to do so. That outcome would produce a lamentable possible increase in terrorism and lower-level conflict. But the many benefits of regional stability would far outweigh the costs.

#### No Iran threat or prolif

Carpenter 2012 (Ted Galen, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, April 12, 2012, "The Pernicious Myth That Iran Can’t Be Deterred", CATO Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/pernicious-myth-iran-cant-be-deterred)

Rumblings about possible war with Iran have grown louder in Washington and other Western capitals in the past few months. Speculation has centered on the likelihood that Israel will launch preemptive air strikes against Iran’s nuclear installations, but there is also considerable talk that the United States might join in such strikes or even take on the primary mission to make certain that the key sites are destroyed.¶ Most advocates of military action against Iran contend that the system of international economic sanctions against the clerical regime is not halting progress on the country’s nuclear program and that the world simply cannot tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran. President Obama has stated repeatedly that it would be “unacceptable” for Tehran to have nuclear weapons, and Mitt Romney, the President’s likely opponent in the November election, says flatly that he will never allow the emergence of a nuclear Iran on his watch.¶ The reason that a growing number of politicians and pundits embrace the war option, even though most of them concede that such a step could create dangerous instability in an already turbulent region, is that they explicitly or implicitly believe that Iran is undeterrable. The typical allegation is that if Iran builds nuclear weapons, it will use them — certainly against Israel, and possibly against the United States or its NATO allies. Most realists dispute that notion, pointing out that the United States has several thousand nuclear weapons and successfully deterred such difficult actors as the Soviet Union and Maoist China. They also note that Israel has between 150 and 300 nuclear weapons — an extremely credible deterrent.¶ None of that matters, hawks contend, because the Iranian leadership is not rational and, therefore, the normal logic of deterrence does not apply. Several war advocates stress Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s obsession with the return of the “12th Imam,” an event in Islamic lore that is to be accompanied by an apocalypse. Clifford May, the head of the neo-conservative Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, argues that “more than a few of Iran’s rulers hold the theological conviction that the return of the Mahdi, the savior, can be brought about only by an apocalypse.” He goes on to cite ultra-hawkish Middle East scholar Bernard Lewis, who asserts that for those who share Ahmadinejad’s vision, “mutually assured destruction is not a deterrent. It’s an inducement.”¶ There are several problems with that thesis. First, Ahmadinejad is hardly the most powerful figure in the Iranian political system. That’s why the all-too-frequent comparisons of Ahmadinejad to Adolf Hitler are especially absurd. The real power in Iran is held by the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and his inner circle of senior clerics. And members of that leadership elite have publicly rebuked Ahmadinejad for devoting too much time and energy to the issue of the 12th Imam.¶ Second, the return of the Mahdi in the midst of an apocalypse is scarcely a unique religious myth. Most major religions have an “end of the world” mystic scenario involving a savior. Christianity, for example, has the Book of Revelations, with the appearance of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse, Armageddon, and the second coming of Jesus Christ. Given the influence of Christianity among American political leaders, foreign critics could make the case that the United States cannot be trusted with nuclear weapons, because a devout Christian leader who believed Revelations would be tempted to bring about Armageddon.¶ The reality is that leaders in any political system usually prefer to enjoy the riches and other perks of this life rather than seek to bring about prematurely the speculative benefits of a next life. There is no credible evidence that the Iranian leadership deviates from that norm. And those leaders certainly know that a nuclear attack on Israel, the United States, or Washington’s NATO allies would trigger a devastating counter-attack that would end their rule and obliterate Iran as a functioning society.¶ It is appropriate to demand that hawks produce evidence — not just allegations — that deterrence is inapplicable because Iranian leaders are suicidal. But one will search in vain for such evidence in the thirty-three years that the clerical regime has held power.¶ There is, in fact, an abundance of counter-evidence. Meir Dagan, the former head of Israel’s Mossad intelligence agency, has stated that he considers Iran’s leaders — including Ahmadinejad — “very rational”. Tehran’s behavior over the years confirms that assessment. During the early stages of the Iraq-Iran war in the 1980s, the Ayatollah Khomeini said that he would “never make peace” with Saddam Hussein. But when the war dragged on for years and the correlation of forces turned against Iran, the country’s military leaders persuaded Khomeini and the clerical elite to conclude a compromise peace. That’s hardly the behavior of an irrational, suicidal political system.¶ Indeed, there is strong evidence that Iranian leaders understand that there are red lines that they dare not cross. One of the specters that Western hawks create is that Iran would transfer nuclear weapons to non-state terrorist groups. But Iran has had chemical weapons in its arsenal since the days of the Shah. There is not a shred of evidence that Tehran has passed on such weapons to any of its political clients, including Hezbollah and Hamas. Given the visceral hatred those organizations harbor toward Israel, it is nearly certain that they would have used chemical weapons against Israeli targets if Iran had ever put them in their hands. Again, it certainly appears that deterrence neutralized any temptation Tehran might have had to engage in reckless conduct.¶ A more rational fear than the notion that Iran would commit suicide by launching a nuclear attack against adversaries who have vast nuclear arsenals, or even that Iran would court a similar fate by supplying terrorist groups with nukes, is the thesis that Tehran would exploit a nuclear shield to then bully its neighbors. But even that fear is greatly exaggerated. As Cato Institute scholar Justin Logan points out in the April issue of The American Conservative, Iran’s conventional forces are weak and the country’s power projection capabilities are meager. A nuclear Iran likely would be capable of deterring a US attack on its homeland — attacks that the United States has a habit of launching against non-nuclear adversaries like Serbia, Iraq and Libya — but such a capability would not translate into Iranian domination of the Middle East. That nightmare scenario is only a little less overwrought than the other theories about the “Iranian threat.”